

Claudius of Turin as an Old Testament
Commentator.
Sources and Methods of Exegesis in his Informationum
litterae et spiritus in libro Regum libri quattuor

Iain M. Douglas

Master of Philosophy

University of Edinburgh

1974



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Iain M. Douglas

Address

Degree M.Phil. Date February 1974.

Title of Thesis Claudius of Turin as an Old Testament Commentator. Sources and Methods of Exegesis in his Informationum litterae et spiritus in libro Regum libri quattuor.

My intention is to give an account of the commentary on the books of Ruth, Samuel and Kings written in the year 824 by Bishop Claudius of Turin. I hope to set it against its historical and theological background and to bring out its distinctive qualities. I shall try to show why the author wrote a catena of extracts from the works of the Church Fathers, which sources he utilised in its composition and how far he was successful in his undertaking.

Since the works of exegesis produced in the early middle ages are a genre of literature that is little understood or appreciated today, I begin with a brief history of exegesis from the earliest days of the Christian Church until the ninth century.

In the second chapter I discuss what Claudius aimed to do in writing the commentary. This leads to the consideration of the books and other sources about the Bible to which Claudius might have turned for suitable information. I have also described how Claudius put together his sources in order to produce his composition.

The third chapter is a brief sketch of the life of Claudius and an account of the events which preceded the publication of the commentary. The special interests of Claudius and the circumstances in which he prepared it for publication are reflected to some extent in the commentary itself. I have also included a discussion of the authorship of the de Imaginibus Sanctorum which has recently been attributed to Claudius of Turin.

In the fourth chapter the manuscripts and printed editions of the commentary are listed and described. I have also written about modern works which deal with the commentary. In an extended footnote I have attempted to trace the history of capitula, i.e. the chapter headings attached to many ancient and medieval manuscripts.

Since the main commentary is almost entirely a catena of extracts from patristic literature, I have given a detailed survey of the sources in the next chapter. J.C. Trombelli, the editor of the version of the commentary published under the name of Claudius of Turin, identified the sources for many passages. I have checked these and added references to modern editions of these sources where they are available. Where I have been able to discover other sources, these also are listed. Those

passages for which no sources have been traced are listed separately with Incipits and Explicitis. I have added notes on matters of interest concerning these.

Since the appendix to the commentary is a separate piece of work, composed in a different way from the main commentary, I have dealt with that in the sixth chapter. It is a set of Quaestiones.

The "little commentary" on Ruth which was placed at the beginning of the main commentary is the subject of chapter seven. As this has never been published, I include a critical edition of the text and a translation. There is also a brief section on the Old Latin text of the book of Ruth.

There are three appendices. The Brevis Chronica of "Claudius Chronologus" has certain links with the commentary on Samuel and Kings. I have included a description of it and a discussion of its authorship. In the second appendix there is a translation of the correspondence that forms an introduction to the commentary. Finally a communication to the Bede Conference 1973, "Bede's de Templo and the commentary on Samuel and Kings by Claudius of Turin", deals with one section of the commentary in a more detailed way than I have used in the dissertation. I have therefore included that also.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	i
Acknowledgements	iv
Abbreviations	vi
CHAPTER ONE	
Exegesis - a brief history up to the ninth century	1
CHAPTER TWO	
Writing a commentary in the ninth century - aims, materials and methods	35
CHAPTER THREE	
The life of Claudius of Turin with special reference to his commentary on Ruth, Samuel and Kings	63
CHAPTER FOUR	
Manuscripts, printed editions and modern works concerning the commentary	95
CHAPTER FIVE	
Sources of the main commentary (a) List of sources (b) Passages identified (c) Passages not identified	115
CHAPTER SIX	
The <u>Quaestiones</u> which form an <u>appendix</u> to the main commentary	137
CHAPTER SEVEN	
The "Little commentary" on Ruth	155
CHAPTER EIGHT	
Conclusions	202
APPENDIX ONE	
The <u>Chronica Brevis</u> attributed to Claudius of Turin	209
APPENDIX TWO	
A translation of the introductory letters attached to the commentary	222
APPENDIX THREE	
Bede's <u>de Templo</u> and the commentary on Samuel and Kings by Claudius of Turin	229
Bibliography	243

SUMMARY

My intention is to give an account of the commentary on the books of Ruth, Samuel and Kings written in the year 824 by Bishop Claudius of Turin. I hope to set it against its historical and theological background and to bring out its distinctive qualities. I shall try to show why the author wrote a catena of extracts from the works of the Church Fathers, which sources he utilised in its composition and how far he was successful in his undertaking.

Since the works of exegesis produced in the early middle ages are a genre of literature that is little understood or appreciated today, I begin with a brief history of exegesis from the earliest days of the Christian Church until the ninth century.

In the second chapter I discuss what Claudius aimed to do in writing the commentary. This leads to the consideration of the books and other sources about the Bible to which Claudius might have turned for suitable information. I have also described how Claudius put together his sources in order to produce his composition.

The third chapter is a brief sketch of the life of Claudius and an account of the events which preceded the publication of the commentary. The special interests of Claudius and the circumstances in which he prepared it for publication are reflected to some extent in the commentary itself. I have also included a discussion of the authorship of the de Imaginibus Sanctorum which has recently been attributed to Claudius of Turin.

In the fourth chapter the manuscripts and printed editions of the commentary are listed and described. I have also written about modern works which deal with the commentary. In an extended footnote I have attempted to trace the history of capitula, i.e. the chapter headings attached to many ancient and medieval manuscripts.

Since the main commentary is almost entirely a catena of extracts from patristic literature, I have given a detailed survey of the sources in the next chapter. J.C. Trombelli, the editor of the version of the commentary published under the name of Claudius of Turin, identified the sources for many passages. I have checked these and added references to modern editions of these sources where they are available. Where I have been able to discover other sources, these also are listed. Those passages for which no sources have been traced are listed separately with Incipits and Explicits. I have added notes on matters of interest concerning these.

Since the appendix to the commentary is a separate piece of work, composed in a different way from the main commentary, I have dealt with that in the sixth chapter. It is a set of Quaestiones.

The "little commentary" on Ruth which was placed at the beginning of the main commentary is the subject of chapter seven. As this has never been published, I include a critical edition of the text and a translation. There is also a brief section on the Old Latin text of the book of Ruth.

There are three appendices. The Brevis Chronica of

"Claudius Chronologus" has certain links with the commentary on Samuel and Kings. I have included a description of it and a discussion of its authorship. In the second appendix there is a translation of the correspondence that forms an introduction to the commentary. Finally a communication to the Bede Conference 1973, "Bede's de Templo and the commentary on Samuel and Kings by Claudius of Turin", deals with one section of the commentary in a more detailed way than I have used in the dissertation. I have therefore included that also.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Prof. D. Bullough who supervised my studies at Edinburgh University in 1964-5 and who suggested the subject of this dissertation when my original proposal to write about the Theology of Missions in the early middle ages proved to be unsuitable. Mr. D.F. Wright, who has supervised my work since then, has assisted me with encouragement and criticism to such an extent that I cannot express the debt of gratitude I owe to him. Without his efforts this volume would never have reached completion.

The staffs of the libraries at New College, Edinburgh, the University of Edinburgh, and the National Library of Scotland have helped me to obtain books and journals. The librarians of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, the Bibliothèque Municipale, Mons, the Bibliotheca Comunale, Mantua, the Cathedral, Pistoia, St. Hieronymus in Urbe, Rome, and the Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna have all kindly supplied me with information and photocopies of manuscripts. I must express my special thanks to the librarian of Stift Zwettl who has lent me a microfilm of one of his manuscripts, and who posted it to India for my examination.

Prof. C.W. Jones, Prof. A. Hamman, Mr. J. Hillgarth, and Prof. J.G. Plante of the M.M.M.L., Collegeville, have all very kindly replied to my enquiries and I have acknowledged their assistance where it is relevant. Prof. L. Bieler has also extended very generous help to me.

I must thank the Overseas Council of the Church of

Scotland for permitting me to use my furlough in 1964-5 for study and the University of Edinburgh for a travelling scholarship in 1965 to examine manuscripts at Paris, Mantua and Pistoia.

My thanks are also due to Mrs. Diana Bland who kindly volunteered to type much of the dissertation for me and to Mrs. P.B. Williams who has typed the final copy so carefully. I have been given leisure to study because of the generous help of my family, especially my wife.

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>C.C.</u>	<u>Corpus Christianorum</u> (Turnholt) Series Latina.
<u>Clavis</u>	Dekkers, E. and Gaar, A. <u>Clavis patrum latinorum</u> (<u>Sacris Erudiri III (1961)</u>). 2nd.ed.
<u>C.L.A.</u>	E.A. Lowe <u>Codices Latini Antiquiores</u> (Oxford, 1934-72).
<u>C.S.E.L.</u>	<u>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</u> (Vienna).
<u>J.T.S.</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies.</u>
<u>MGH</u>	<u>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</u> <u>Ep = Epistulae</u> <u>EpKA = Epistulae Karolingii Aevi</u> <u>A.A. = Auctores Antiquissimi</u>
<u>MPG</u>	J. Migne <u>Patrologiae cursus completus; series graeca.</u>
<u>MPL</u>	J. Migne <u>Patrologiae cursus completus; series latina.</u>
<u>Rev. Bén.</u>	<u>Revue Bénédictine.</u>
<u>Rev. Bibl.</u>	<u>Revue Biblique.</u>

CHAPTER ONE

In this chapter I plan to show the development of exegesis up to the time of Claudius. His commentary on Samuel and Kings was the end product of a long tradition of study of and meditation on the Bible. His own distinctive contribution to the study of the Bible must be seen in the context of that tradition.

Exegesis is the unfolding of the true sense of a book. The Bible, like all other religious books, was written in specific places and times. Those who believe in it wish to apply its truths to their own situation which may be very different from that of the original writers. With the passage of time, traditions are forgotten and practices change. Words pass out of current use, or change their meaning. Believers may speak another language and live far from the scenes to which their book refers. For all of these reasons and many more, even the most reverent believer will ask for scholarly assistance, so that he may understand the source of his belief.

If someone who has had no introduction to the genre of early mediaeval exegesis is invited to read part of a commentary by one of the greatest names such as Bede, he will be puzzled and amused at what he finds there. Some passages will show an acute insight into the meaning of the book, there will be some advice of great value, and a great mass of what can only be described as "non-sense", because it does not seem to be related in a meaningful way to the text of the book.

A commentator who writes for people today, whether for

scholars or for a more general public, will try to use all the techniques available to him in order to come as near as possible to the situation of the author. Textual and literary studies will be called upon to help in reproducing the exact words used by the author and the sources from which he drew his ideas and material. Historical and related studies will help the scholar to understand the background of thought and the particular situation in which the author stood. If we wish to understand the Book of Jeremiah, we try to enter as imaginatively as we can into the position of the prophet himself.

Even with all the tools available to the scholar, this attempt is as much an act of faith as a scientific procedure. Some of the prophecies of Jeremiah can never be explained to the satisfaction of all, or are susceptible of interpretation in more than one way, depending on the presuppositions accepted by the scholar.

In the Middle Ages too, the writings of the Old Testament prophets seemed as obscure as they often do today to us. To the scholar of those times the obscure passages suggested that the Bible should not be handled in a literal way only. The obscurities, like signposts, showed that behind the plain sense of much of the Bible there lay a hidden, esoteric, higher sense. The message of the Bible had been encoded to screen it from the gaze of the profane. The surface meaning of the Bible was useful and through this one might attain to a knowledge sufficient for salvation. The Christian religion was for everyone, not just for the scholar. There were, however,

delights for the learned in the "spiritual sense" of Scripture, which ^{resolved} reconciled all difficulties of interpretation and showed the truth of the Gospel in every page and line of the Bible. What today would be regarded as an insoluble problem was then seen as a challenge to find the appropriate explanation.

As in modern sciences and pseudo-sciences such as astrology, mediaeval exegesis had its own inner logic and tools of work. Just as the human body was conceived of as ^{being} divisible into three parts, body, mind and spirit, so the study of the Scriptures could be carried on in at least three ways. These correspond to the triad of terms used for the human body and are the literal, allegorical and moral senses. This triad, adumbrated by the Jewish scholar, Philo of Alexandria, was first stated clearly by the great Christian exegete, Origen, in the third century.¹

The literal sense covered all the surface meaning of a passage, its relation to other passages, description of places, people, customs and ideas. The allegorical sense related the passage to other places, people or ideas in what must be considered an arbitrary way. The Book of Ruth is a story which can be read for its own sake. Its author's intention is clear - to attack the exclusiveness of his Jewish contemporaries by pointing out that King David's ancestry included a foreign woman. Mediaeval commentators suggested that the story is an allegory of the rejection of Christ by the Jews

1. R.C.P. Hanson, Allegory and Event, 235, referring to Peri Archon, IV; 2.45.

and the acceptance of the Gentiles into the church, with each detail of the story referring to a particular incident or theological idea.

An allegorical interpretation goes behind the historical reality of a person, place or event and identifies it with something else. Naomi, Elimelech, Ruth, Moab, the famine and the other details of the Book of Ruth are interpreted as the Synagogue, the Law, the Church and so on. Jerusalem wherever it occurs in the Bible is not a city as much as a state of mind, the blessedness of the believer. In a prayer like that of Augustine in the Confessions, "remembering Jerusalem with my heart stretching upwards in longing for it; Jerusalem my Fatherland, Jerusalem who is my mother ...",² we have an imaginative use of allegory. Unfortunately, the encyclopaedists like Origen, and, at an inferior level, Eucherius of Lyons, insisted on applying allegory to every possible detail of the Bible.

The moral, or 'anagogic', sense is that which encourages good behaviour. The battles in the Old Testament are seen as a struggle between the forces of wickedness and good in a man's soul. When the Abbot of Psalmody, Theutmir, asked Claudius of Turin to send him a commentary on parts of Samuel and Kings, he requested an explanation of seventy-two passages from the books, "first of all as far as one can rely on the literal sense; secondly if it takes an allegorical sense; and thirdly the moral sense throughout".³ Theutmir was repeating

2. Augustine, Confessions XII, xvi, 23.

3. MGH EpKA II, 605.

the triad of Origen's senses of Scripture, but no doubt because of his practical experience as an abbot he was principally concerned with the moral sense, the one most obviously applied to the daily conduct of life.

Besides the three senses of Scripture discussed, other technical terms and classifications were used. Angelomus of Luxeuil, a disciple of Hrabanus Maurus, at one point spoke of seven senses of Scripture.⁴

One term which has gained wider currency in recent years is typology, mainly through the work of a group of Roman Catholic scholars including Daniélou and de Lubac. Allegorical interpretations are not taken seriously today by anyone. It is suggested however that typology, although akin to allegory, is acceptable because it provides a way of interpreting the Bible which is in line with the true meaning of the Bible. An example of a type from the Bible is Paul's discussion of Christ as the second Adam in Romans V. Typology takes one person or event in the Bible and compares it with another. Jesus is to be understood as the second Adam, Joshua or David, fulfilling the true nature and destiny of each of these characters but without removing from the original characters their significance of historicity. He sums up what they were or should have been.

Two recent studies have suggested modifications in the way in which we ought to view patristic and mediaeval exegesis. R.P.C. Hanson in Allegory and Event has collected together evidence to show that there is more than one kind of Allegory

4. MPL CXV, 245-6.

to be found. Most studies take their starting point from Philo of Alexandria, who allegorised much of the Old Testament. He referred each event of the Bible to the journey of the human soul and so we might talk of his work as a psychological interpretation. The Rabbis of Palestine seem to have used a form of allegory.⁵ "The verse 'and they went three days in the wilderness and found no water' is interpreted by the allegorists to mean that they found no law or religious instruction." This might be described as an allegory which relates the historical to the historical, the Messianic or eschatological, but not the external historical event to the mental psychological state. Hanson suggests that we may regard this form of allegory as a part of the Jewish background to the New Testament and as necessary to a true understanding of it, although it does not in his opinion form part of the irreducible 'kerygma' of the Gospel.

A recent article by Professor C.W. Jones⁶ has pointed out that, "Recently historians and critics of exegesis have induced each other to presume that the Fathers accepted and adhered to rules and formulas of interpretation of considerable rigor and rigidity."⁷ He has shown that for Bede, one of the more careful scholars, 'typus' can lead to a 'spiritual', a 'moral' or 'anagogical' meaning, or any combination.⁸ Bede adhered to no strict verbal system, but he followed the

5. Hanson, op.cit., 31.

6. "Bede's Commentary on Genesis" in Sacris Erudiri XIX (1969-70), 115-198.

7. op.cit., 135-6.

8. op.cit., 151.

preacher's homiletic method, using whatever was profitable to his readers. "Scripture is to be grasped primarily through the faithful imagination, everywhere illuminated".⁹

From my study of Claudius' commentary I must agree with Professor Jones. Although Claudius was asked to interpret the books on three levels, I find that one can distinguish clearly between the literal and the spiritual senses, but that there is no definite distinction between different forms of the spiritual sense.

It must be stressed that there were many advantages in the use of allegory. Since there was no sense of progressive revelation in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, the Old Testament with its declensions from the high moral standards of the New was saved for the Church. Heretics and Jews attacked the Church's use of it from different angles. The heretics pointed out inconsistencies, unchristian practices such as polygamy and other primitive customs, while the Jews asked why the Christians did not obey the Law which was believed to have been revealed by God. Christian theologians allegorised the Old Testament and found the New in every page of it. The Church read back into the whole of the Bible what it expected to find there - the truth about Jesus Christ.

People in late Antiquity and the Middle Ages had a poorly developed sense of the historical. They found it difficult to conceive of the development of institutions and of changes of ideas. This led to grotesque blunders in legal matters and a blindness to certain kinds of social change that

9. op.cit., 158.

amaze us today. The relationships between kings and nobility or between the secular power and the papacy were based not only on the present realities of power but also on misinterpretations of the past. Allegory helped men in the church to relate the far off events of the Bible to their own situation in a way that was emotionally appealing and was basically true to Christian theology.

India today is still a country with a poorly developed sense of the historical. It was interesting for me to find how strongly the quotations from Daniélou's From Shadows to Reality appealed to Indians when I used them in sermons. For Indian Christians the whole of the Bible is equally true, but it does not seem to be equally profitable. Typology would offer one way of helping them to digest the less helpful parts.

Four different literary forms were chiefly used in the writing of books of exegesis. The earliest was that of question and answer; it probably grew out of the informal discussions of a scholar and his pupils. It survived as a literary form because of a supposed liveliness of manner. Yet a dialogue, however skilfully composed, becomes boring if carried on too long. While it may be suitable for philosophical discussion, with more than one point of view, it does not serve well for the communication of information. Eucherius of Lyons wrote a dialogue commentary on most of the books of the Bible in the fifth century.¹⁰ The questions and most of

10. MPL L, 773-812; Book I of Instructionum libri.

the answers are very brief, but the repetition of the same formulae over and over again produces a feeling of tedium, which is in that case enhanced by the generally low level of intelligence displayed by the author.

Not all of the Quaestiones et Responsiones however were written in dialogue form. Augustine, Jerome, Bede and many others wrote in the form that might be described as an open letter, directing their answers at the correspondent who had asked the questions, but also aiming at publication as well. Theutmir asked Claudius for a commentary of this sort, quoting the example of Bede's XXX Quaestiones in Regum as a precedent, and giving a list of seventy-two difficult passages to be discussed.

Scholia were short articles on problems of interest to the scholar, and might best be described as the ancient equivalent of the shorter articles that are to be found in learned journals today. These might circulate separately, or could be gathered into collections.

Many homilies have survived and these too contain much exegetical material. Since they were preached to a congregation of ordinary people, they had to be popular in style and material. The preacher aimed at influencing the beliefs and morals of his audience or readers, and so we find little of learning for its own sake.

There were full scale commentaries, in which the author tried to cover in detail all the difficulties found in part of or the whole of a book of the Bible.

In practice these four categories were not as mutually

exclusive as these definitions might appear, and there are works which we would find difficult to assign to one category. The last three books of Augustine's Confessions consist of exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis. Can they be described as a short commentary, a scholion or a sermon?

Jerome wrote a set of Quaestiones discussing the Hebrew and Greek texts underlying the Latin versions of the Book of Psalms. This was addressed to two Christian Goths, but in view of the recent admission of that tribe into the circle of civilised nations and their conversion to Christianity, it would seem unlikely that there were many Goths with a basic knowledge of the Latin language, far less capable of discussing the finer points of Hebrew-Latin translation. Bardy considers that the Quaestio form is used here to make the scholia of which it consists a little more palatable to the ordinary reader. If Goths can ask such questions, high born Roman ladies can make an attempt to understand the answers.¹¹

The Greeks of the Hellenistic period were the first people who wrote exegesis in order to explain their sacred books. The works of Homer and Hesiod were considered to enshrine the doctrines of Hellenic religion. Some grammarians concentrated their attention on the minutiae of grammar and syntax, since Homeric Greek was very different from the classical language of the sixth century.

11. Rev. Bibl. XLI (1932), 361f.

Others would include some discussion of the deeper problems raised by the text. Since some parts of the poems were felt to be repugnant if taken in a literal sense, some means had to be found of interpreting these so that those who followed Greek religion would find them wholesome and profitable. The stories of immoral Gods who quarrelled among themselves had to be reconciled with the belief then current that the universe was ruled by a moral power. The solution was found in allegory. The poems did not mean what they seemed to mean.

Allegory did not only provide an answer; it seemed the most appropriate way in which religious truth might be communicated to the believer. There were many religious truths which could not be apprehended in the cold, hard light of reason. Even Socrates and Plato had approved of the Mysteries of Eleusis. So "Homeric allegoresis was in harmony with one of the basic characteristics of Greek religious thought; the belief that the Gods express themselves in cryptic form - in oracles, in mysteries. It was the duty of the discerning man to see through these veils and coverings which hid the secret from the eyes of the crowd".¹²

Philosophers wished to show that their teachings were not only in accord with the sacred books of their culture, but that they were the true meaning of these books. So philosophers allegorised the details of the poems to suit their teachings. Anaxagoras in the fifth century before Christ

12.E.R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, 205.

said that the subject of Homer's poetry was "virtue and justice". A disciple changed Homer's characters into natural philosophy, saying that Achilles was the sun, Helen the earth, Paris the air and so on.¹³ Heracleitus allegorised the wanderings of Odysseus into a description of the various ills into which a man's life can fall.¹⁴

We can distinguish three different main schools of interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures which were current in the first century A.D. The orthodox rabbinic school laid stress on the literal sense of the Old Testament, especially its legal aspects. The Bible provided rules for all human conduct. Allegory was not forbidden, but was not thought to be of much importance.

A second group are best known through the Dead Sea Scrolls. They interpreted the Old Testament in apocalyptic terms and looked forward to the great crises which would usher in the Kingdom of God.

The third method of interpretation was adapted from the Greek allegorical method and this was used by the great Alexandrian scholar Philo. He attempted to make biblical religion relevant to the Hellenistic culture of his day by restating the essential truths in terms that would be understandable to the educated Greek. Since the Old Testament contained things that would appear 'foolishness' or even objectionable if taken literally, these passages must conceal some esoteric truth. The seeker after truth would find the

13. Hanson, op.cit., 56f.

14. Hanson, op.cit., 254.

key to the puzzle, an allegorical interpretation.

Philo related each part of the Old Testament to the progress of the individual soul towards a state of blessedness. When he discussed the Garden of Eden, he said that, "This description is, I think, intended symbolically rather than literally; for never yet have trees of life or understanding appeared on earth, nor is it likely that they will appear hereafter. No, Moses evidently signifies by the pleasaunce the ruling power of the soul which is full of countless opinions, as it might be of plants; and by the tree of life he signifies reverence toward God, the greatest of the virtues, by means of which the soul attains to immortality..."¹⁵

Philo's methods were to be taken up with great success by Christian exegetes, and became the basis for the work of Origen and his successors. The Jews themselves seem to have turned away from allegorical interpretations, perhaps because, as Hanson suggests, they saw that the Christians used allegory and typology in order to retain the Old Testament as a holy book.¹⁶

The first Christian exegesis of the Bible (the Old Testament) may be found in the New. When Jesus spoke about divorce in Matthew XIX, 3-9, he compared one part of the Bible with another in the Rabbinic style. In Galatians IV, 22-26, we have, in the two sons of Abraham, an allegory of the two covenants which was of the same kind as the allegory used by Palestinian Rabbis.

15. Philo, On the Creation, 154 (LIV); Loeb ed., 122.

16. Hanson, op.cit., 35.

Justin Martyr in the early second century used passages from the Old Testament to convince Jews of the truth of the gospel. When asked by Trypho why it was necessary for Jesus to die in such a manner he cited Moses holding up his hands in the battle against the Amalekites (Exodus XVII, 10-12) and the lifting up of the serpent (Numbers XXI, 9) as proof texts. Perhaps these were arguments already traditional (Cf. John III, 14).¹⁷

Orthodox Christians were not the first to write commentaries on the books of the New Testament. Gnostics, the "existentialists" of the ancient world, found support for their teachings in a reinterpretation of the Bible. The Gnostic sects taught an amalgam of Jewish, Christian and Greek beliefs. W. Foerster suggests on page one of Gnosis, I that their doctrine may be comprehended in the phrase, "Gold in Mud". The gold of the human soul is imprisoned in the mud of earthly existence, able to recognise the light which is God and join in a fellowship with Him and with other souls which have recognised their true nature. Allegory seemed to them an appropriate way of understanding religious truth, since the spiritual message is concealed behind the facade of the literal sense.

Through allegory the Valentinian sect were able to discover their distinctive teachings in the Bible. Ptolemaeus, in his Letter to Flora, moved very subtly and persuasively from Christian beliefs about the Jewish Law and about morality to the making of a distinction between the "Good God" and the

17. Trypho XC, 4; XXI, 1-4.

"God of Justice". Heracleon's work on the Gospel of John profoundly influenced Origen. Origen could not challenge the allegorical method of Heracleon since it was identical with his own. He said that some of the conclusions were "forced", but accepted other conclusions as true.

About the year 204 the antipope Hippolytus of Rome began to compose his commentaries on Daniel and Song of Songs as well as other treatises. His works did not attract the interest of later generations and so have mainly survived in translations into [obscure] languages such as Armenian and Georgian. The Greek originals have almost entirely disappeared. A younger contemporary, Origen of Alexandria, far outshone him in ability. Origen possessed an encyclopaedic memory and had read widely in pagan and Christian literature. When still under the age of eighteen, he was appointed to be head of the Catechetical school in Alexandria. Later he moved to Caesarea which he made his home for the later part of his life. He died in 253-4 at the age of seventy from his sufferings during a persecution. He was the most prolific of all the Church Fathers, although the great bulk of his work has not survived.

His studies on the Bible cover the whole field of exegesis. His contribution to textual criticism may have been overrated, but he did show interest in early versions of the Old Testament and his great Hexapla, which contained the Hebrew, the Septuagint and other translations into Greek, was consulted by scholars including Jerome. His conversations with Jews in order to learn Hebrew also gave him access to Jewish Biblical teaching.

Allegorical interpretations had been used before the time of Origen, but hesitantly and unsystematically. He naturalised the psychological allegorising of Philo and made it the most important mode of interpretation. His doctrine of scripture demanded that the Bible be inerrant. Since the literal sense of some passages was bad, there must be a spiritual sense of these passages that was good. Therefore he claimed that there was a spiritual sense to all of scripture but not a literal one. He analysed the great themes of the Bible and provided the allegorising interpretations that were to be accepted and adapted by his successors.

Origen was a man of peace, who believed in the use of reason in his discussions with those outside the Church, whether pagan or heretic. He was gentle, modest, and a loyal son of the Church. Although he may seem at first sight to be too 'thirled' to the ideas of his own time, and wished to make the Bible intelligible in terms of the categories of Hellenistic thought, he did aim to be loyal to the Christian tradition and sometimes succeeded in a rather unexpected way.

R.C.P. Hanson discusses a passage from one of his commentaries, on Ps. IV,6 and concludes that Origen "does not understand the outlook of the author of Deuteronomy and his interpretation of Paul is unpauline (i.e. in parallels mentioned by Origen). But in spite of this his firm grasp of the fundamentals of the Christian faith has kept his interpretation of the passage sound."¹⁸ This rather back-handed compliment indicates something of the quality of

18. Hanson, op.cit., 182.

Christian thought that lay behind Origen's labours in the field of exegesis.

Although Origen was condemned posthumously for some of his teachings, by then several works had been translated into Latin by Jerome, Rufinus and possibly others. These Homilies and commentaries do not seem to have been well known in the ninth century, although Claudius and Hrabanus Maurus both mention his name among their authorities.^{19,20}

Not all scholars who followed Origen in time also followed him in believing that allegory was the solution to all problems of exegesis. A group of scholars centred on Antioch used historical and literary critical study in expounding the Bible, eschewing all use of allegory. Diodore of Tarsus was the founder of this school. Although renowned in his own day as a pillar of orthodoxy, he was later condemned for Nestorianism, and so his writings were systematically destroyed. These included commentaries on all the Old Testament and part of the New.²¹

His pupils, Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom, both wrote extensively and we still possess some of the writings of the former and much of the latter. However the influence of this Antiochene school was slight in the West during the Middle Ages, since little was translated, and few quotations from them can be traced in Latin writings. Some

19. MGH EpKA II, 594; MGH EpKA III, 388, 430, 440.

20. See the article by J. Chatillon, "Isidore et Origène" in Mélanges André Robert, 537-547.

21. B. Altaner, Patrology, 369-70.

Irish scholars did use their work, but perhaps their work seemed dry and uninteresting to other Latin scholars compared with the fanciful allegorical interpretations of the Alexandrian school.

In Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings there is a section consisting of the major part of a homily attributed to John Chrysostom.²² I do not know who made the attribution to Chrysostom, but it would seem to be false.

Victorinus of Pettau, who died in 304, wrote commentaries on books of the Old Testament, Matthew and the Apocalypse. Of these only a part of the commentary on the Apocalypse has survived. His works are said to depend on earlier writers including Hippolytus and especially Origen. Hilary of Poitiers came fifty years later with commentaries on Matthew, some of the Psalms, Job, and a "Tractatus Mysteriorum" which treats of the types or prophetic patterns of the Old Testament. Both of these writers stressed the allegorical sense of Scripture. They can claim to have naturalised Origenist interpretations in the Latin language.

In the late fourth and early fifth centuries Latin exegesis reached the peak of its excellence in the work of three great figures, Augustine, Jerome and the unknown writer who goes under the name of 'Ambrosiaster'. The real Ambrose, Bishop of Milan from 374 to 397, was also an exegete of some importance. He was widely read in Greek and his commentaries depend on the work of Origen and Basil of Caesarea. They contain little of the literal or historical, but concentrate

22. MPL CIV, 747c ff.

on the allegorical sense and the moral lessons to be drawn from the allegories.

The Donatist Tyconius wrote a book on hermeneutics which was praised by Augustine and from which he made extensive borrowings in his De Doctrina Christiana.

The commentary on the Pauline Epistles which was attributed to Ambrose, and which now goes under the name of "Ambrosiaster" is, "generally considered a first class achievement. It gives a frequently penetrating exegesis which reveals the historical sense and is averse to allegorical subtleties, without however entirely excluding types".²³

The author of this commentary also wrote Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti which is a collection of one hundred and twenty-seven exegetical and theological questions to which solutions are offered.²⁴ Laistner describes it as a collection of essays, as it consists of paragraphs of varying lengths, some of which are homilies, brief biographies of biblical characters, some polemical arguments, others explanations of textual difficulties. It is a very miscellaneous collection, but is the work of one person, who possesses the authority, decisiveness and clarity which we consider to be peculiarly Roman.

It is strange then that despite all that is known of the author, that he lived in or near Rome and was closely involved in the affairs of the Roman church during the Pontificate of

23. Altaner, op.cit., 457.

24. Ed. A. Souter C.S.E.L. L (Vienna, 1908).

Damasus (i.e. 366-384), and that Damasus and Augustine both quoted directly from his works, his name is unknown. The Quaestiones, which had a wide circulation in the ninth century, circulated under the name of Augustine. Alcuin and Smaragdus made use of them in commentaries and no less than six manuscripts of the ninth century survive.

It is not surprising that the Quaestiones were attached to the name of Augustine, since he wrote a number of sets of Quaestiones. Augustine's importance as a commentator does not lie in originality of methods or material, but rather in his deep insight into the spiritual needs of man and his incomparable gift of clothing his thoughts in the greatest yet most simple oratory. The formal qualifications that Augustine brought to his task were few. At the outset of his career as an exegete he did not possess a good knowledge of the Bible. His knowledge of Greek always remained rather sketchy and he never did learn any Hebrew. In his favour were the long literary training in the Latin classics he had received, his formidable intellect, and a willingness to learn from any source, including schismatics like the Donatist Tyconius.

He began with an examination of the beginning of Genesis in order to answer the criticisms of the Manichees whose disciple he had once been. He was to return to the same part of the Bible three times more, at the end of the Confessions and twice in commentaries "ad litteram". The allegories of his first commentary, in the style of Ambrose, must have proved less palatable in later years.

Augustine planned to compose a number of lengthy commentaries on different parts of the Bible. However,

pressure of work seems to have crowded out most of these projects. The commentaries on the Gospel of John and on Psalms are sets of sermons preached to his flock at Hippo. He could never be a disinterested scholar of the Bible, confining his knowledge to the study. He told Jerome, "If I gain any stock of knowledge (of the Scriptures) I pay it out immediately to the people of God."²⁵

The commentary on Galatians is the only true verse by verse commentary that was finished. Two other commentaries, on Genesis and Romans, were abandoned when only partly complete. Augustine had planned to explain important passages in all the books of the Old Testament, by means of Quaestiones, but the book was only carried forward as far as Judges. Isidore of Seville, in a later age, followed a similar plan.

Although it may not have been done in such a systematic way as Augustine would have liked, the volume of work done on the Bible is immense. There are many sets of Quaestiones, Locutiones and innumerable sermons, taken down in shorthand and then sometimes corrected by the Bishop himself. In theological works like "The City of God" are to be found, not merely references to the Bible, but long passages of interpretation. The last three books of the "Confessions" are an extended meditation and commentary on the beginning of Genesis.

I wish to mention one work in particular since it was used by Claudius in the composition of his commentary on Samuel and Kings. It is a measure of the respect in which

25. Ep. 73.ii.5 as quoted in P. Brown, Augustine of Hippo, 252.

he was held that Simplicianus, Bishop of Milan in succession to Ambrose, should turn to this neophyte to ask for the explanation of some difficult passages in Romans and in Samuel and Kings. The questions on Romans deal with Law and Grace, and have been much studied for the light they shed on the development of Augustine's thought. The five problems in Samuel and Kings are perhaps of less importance from a theological point of view. The attitude in which one prays, whether it be standing, sitting, kneeling or lying prostrate, is more a matter of convenience than of deep significance as Augustine says.²⁶

God's rejection of Saul and the sending of an evil spirit upon him and the raising of the spirit of Samuel by the witch of Endor do raise fundamental problems about the nature and powers of the forces of evil which are of more than academic importance even today as they were in the world of late Antiquity.

P. Brown notes that Augustine returned to the historical books of the Old Testament in his last three years.

"Previously his views on grace and free will had been developed in terms of the thought of Paul - of the personal moral struggle, of the renewing power of Christ. Now, Augustine will show that, at the age of seventy-two, he was still capable of pouring his ideas into yet another and stranger mould. What for the Pelagians had been a straightforward collection of examples of good and evil actions becomes, with Augustine, a history tinged with mystery..."²⁷

26. Augustine, Ad Simplicianum II, 4 (C.C. XLIV, 86-87).

27. Brown, op.cit., 428.

The third great exegete and student of the Bible in this period is Jerome, who was born in Dalmatia, educated in Rome, and finally settled in Bethlehem. He worked as a translator and reviser of the Latin Bible, as translator of Greek exegetical and other Christian writings, and as an original exegete himself. He and his friend Rufinus translated many of the homilies by Origen and so introduced these to a readership in the West where Greek was almost unknown. The revision of the Latin Bible, proposed to him by Pope Damasus, led gradually to a new translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew.

The commentaries on books of both Old and New Testament are not of the highest quality. Although they do display his scholarship in Greek and Hebrew and his interest in geography, history and archaeology, they seem to have been written in haste and show signs of carelessness. He wrote one work, the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim, which was one of a series of treatises in which he explained to the Latin world his researches into the Hebrew language. Bardy considered this "un vrai commentaire de ce livre sous forme de scholies".²⁸

Jerome also wrote a number of letters in order to answer questions sent him by friends. One of these has a special interest since it consists of five questions on Genesis which Pope Damasus sent to him. Examination shows that these were taken from the Quaestiones of the figure whom we know as Ambrosiaster. Was Damasus anxious to compare the answers to find out whether that writer could be considered completely

28. Rev. Bibl. XLI (1932), 256.

orthodox? As we noted earlier, Jerome seems also to have written to imaginary correspondents in the hope that this literary convention would make some of his scholarship more palatable to the ordinary Christian.

In their examination of the Bible, Jerome and Augustine accepted the tradition of exegesis laid down by their predecessors. Augustine's work can be described as more that of a theologian and preacher than a scholar of the text; Jerome had wide scholarly interests but was careless and hurried in writing his commentaries, and was too much a follower of Origen and of allegorical methods to tackle some of the problems of the text.

Other writers of the time include Pelagius, Augustine's opponent in the debate about free will. He wrote a commentary on the Pauline Epistles which survives in one ninth century manuscript. It did however have a much wider circulation in an edition revised by Cassiodorus to eliminate doubtful passages. It is found in the manuscript tradition under the names of Jerome and Primasius.²⁹

Later generations were to go on writing about the Bible, but there were few advances to record until the period of Bede. Eucherius, the Bishop of Lyons from 434 until about 455, wrote exegetical works, of which one, the Instructiones ad Salonium libri duo, is of some value. The first book consists of answers to problems drawn from many of the books of both Old and New Testament, and draws on sources which include Augustine, Jerome and Ambrosiaster. The questions on Kings are:

29. MPL XXX, 645-902; LXVIII, 413-686; M.L.W. Laistner, Thought and Letters, 99.

Quid est, quod Saulem dominus postea reprobat regem quem prius in regnum legendum putavit?

Quo modo accipiendum est, quod in scripturis paenitere dominus saepe memoratur, sicut etiam de Saule cum dicit: paenitet me, quod constituerim Saul regem?

Legimus quod suffocabat Saul spiritus malus domini. Quo modo domini, si malus?

Quid est, quod cum aliquanta hic dominus vindicet, non vindicat omnia?

Umbram Samuelis Pythonissa quem ad modum potuit evocare?

Cum factum non sit, quo modo oranti Ezechiae quindecim anni quasi ad praefinitum vitae tempus adduntur?³⁰

The answers are brief and sensible, without entering into any deep mysteries or flights of fancy.

The second book is a brief encyclopaedia of the Bible, giving explanations of the meaning of Greek and Hebrew words, and names of people and places. His Formulae Spiritualis Intelligentiae is a collection of allegorical interpretations, each adorned by an appropriate verse. The Formulae gives the impression of a narrow and unimaginative intellect to us, but the etymologies of Isidore are based on the same idea and provided one of the source books for the interpreters of the Middle Ages. Both must be seen as products of the education of Late Antiquity, which emphasised minute analysis and rigid systematisation of ideas. Since every verse must speak of the divine revelation, birds, beasts, parts of the body, numbers and indeed everything must be referred either to the Lord,

30. C.S.E.L. XXXI, 82-3.

Christ, the Church, the saints, or to their enemies.

Eucherius has escaped the limelight given to his illustrious contemporaries, Jerome and Augustine. Justly so, since he was so much inferior in every way. However his meagre compilations point the way towards the Middle Ages, where horizons were narrowed and books were few. Works attributed to Salonius, his son and the dedicatee of the Instructiones, have been recently shown to be products of the Carolingian period.³¹

Passing over nearly a century we come to Caesarius, Bishop of Arles from 502 to 542. Two hundred and thirty-eight sermons have survived, some attributed to Augustine. Altaner describes him as "perhaps the greatest popular preacher of the old Latin Church after Augustine".³²

The importance of Cassiodorus lies more in the history of the transmission of learning than in any original contribution to exegesis. His own commentaries are the Commenta Psalterii, a lengthy work heavily indebted to Augustine's commentary on the Psalms, and the Complexiones, which discusses important passages in Acts, the Epistles and Revelation. At his monastery at Vivarium were translated Greek commentaries, histories and works by Josephus. Pelagius' commentaries were revised to make them fit for the eyes of the orthodox. In the Institutiones Divinarum Lectionum he provided a summary of methods of exegesis and a bibliography of commentaries on

31. J. Weiss, "Essai de datation du Commentaire sur les Proverbes attribué abusivement à Salonius" in Sacris Erudiri XIX (1969-70), 77-114.

32. Altaner, op.cit., 569.

the Bible. It is to be regretted that this was not well known in the ninth century.³³

In the Institutiones is described a manuscript compiled at the orders of Cassiodorus containing the following works on Samuel and Kings:-

- (1) Four homilies of Origen.
- (2) Augustine's Ad Simplicianum, Book II.
- (3) Augustine's sermon on Absalom.
- (4) Three Quaestiones by Augustine,
 (I Reg. XVII "Ubi David Goliath expugnavit"
 III Reg. XVII "De Elia et vidua Sareptana"
 IV Reg. II. "Ubi Elizeus fontem mortiferum
 benedixit".)
- (5) From Jerome's Ad Abundantium three Quaestiones,
 (III Reg. I
 III Reg. II
 II Reg. XVI.)
- (6) Another homily by Origen.
- (7) Ambrose, followed by Jerome and a sermon of Augustine, on the judgement of Solomon.
- (8) Jerome to Vitalis on the sons of Solomon and Achaz.
- (9) Augustine's City of God, Book XVII, 4.
- (10) A sermon by Origen on II Chronicles.³⁴

While this is far from being a real commentary, it is not so far from the commentaries of Claudius and Hrabanus.

33. Laistner, op.cit., 102.

34. MPL LXX, 1112-4.

Pope Gregory the Great and Isidore, Bishop of Seville, were the writers who dominated the scene of biblical studies at the end of the sixth century. Gregory was a keen student of Augustine's thought, and might be described as a populariser of the thought of Augustine. The Homilies and the Moralia in Job were to be among the most influential books of the Middle Ages. The combination of mystical, allegorical interpretation with ethical exhortation was immensely important. His appeal is rather to the heart than to the head. The style is simple and lively. His thought is clearly expressed.

In the prefatory letter to the Moralia in Job we find that his intention was to use all the resources of biblical study open to him, passing over certain passages quickly with a literal exposition, digging deeper in others with allegorical study of biblical typology, using the moral sense for others and again using all three where necessary. The literal sense is the foundation, the typological sense is the structure of the building, and the moral sense provides a coat of paint for it.³⁵ In practice the literal exposition of the text forms a very small part of the whole and, as Gregory proceeded by means of digressions and allusions to other biblical passages, there is little systematic study of the meaning of the book. It is rather to be seen as a great treasure house of allegorical interpretations of the Bible.

A disciple of Gregory, Paterius, prepared a collection of extracts from the works of Gregory, arranging them under the various parts of the books of the Bible to which they

35. Moralia in Job, 3 in Sources Chrét., 118.

refer. To us nowadays, with many indexes available, this might seem superfluous, but to the mediaeval scholar it was of great value. It is remarkable to discover from a perusal of Paterius how fully Gregory has dealt with the Bible in the Moralia. There is hardly a book to which he did not allude, and he seems to have something to say on almost every important question. Job is the centre of his thought, but threads of meaning stretch out from there to connect it with the whole of the Bible. Only the first part of the collection made by Paterius has survived and so the printed editions have been completed by a similar collection made in the Middle Ages. Bede lamented the fact, that, although he knew of the existence of Paterius' collection, he had been unable to get hold of a copy.³⁶

Gregory dedicated the Moralia to Leander, the bishop of Seville, who was succeeded by his younger brother, Isidore. He was the first to make use of Gregory's commentaries in the preparation of his own. The Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum is based almost entirely on the works of earlier commentators including Origen, Augustine and Jerome, and others including Gregory, as he says himself in the introduction.³⁷ We are given direct quotations rather than the rephrasing of an author's thought that literary taste had earlier required. The Quaestiones proved very useful to the writers of the Carolingian period like Wigbod, Claudius and Hrabanus. It

36. MPL XCI, 1223B.

37. MPL LXXXIII, 209.

was both a model and a useful source for the composition of their own fuller commentaries. However Isidore was still a writer of some originality. Although his most famous works are compilations, he did not merely transmit the knowledge of the classical period, but selected with care from the wide field of scholarship available to him. Isidore marks the close of the period of the Fathers. Even if later ages treated his work with respect, he said that he was only a mouthpiece for the eloquence of the "Veteres".³⁸

Another commentary, the De Veteri et Novo Testamento Quaestiones has been attributed to Isidore, but is considered to be by a Spaniard of the seventh century. Although several names have been suggested no real evidence has been offered. One proposed name is that of Felix of Urgel, the eighth century heretic with whom Claudius of Turin was linked by his enemies. It has little value as a compilation, but shows that learning was not dead in that period in the old Roman Empire.

There are few other signs that the Bible was being studied at all except in the monasteries of Ireland. Irish biblical study remained almost completely unknown to the scholars of the Middle Ages and has survived in fragments only. What has remained exists in a single copy only in most cases; later writers show few signs of having read any of it. These works lay outside the main stream of exegesis which flowed through Philo and Origen to Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory, and which reappears in Bede, Alcuin and the Carolingians. They show

38. MPL LXXXIII, 209.

the influence of Antiochene exegesis, making use of Latin translations of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The scholia discuss questions about the meaning of the text, rather than associate it immediately through allegory with the central theological statements of Christian belief or the moral imperatives of that belief.

Thirteen hundred years ago Bede was born in the Kingdom of Northumbria, a country where Christianity had been established for less than fifty years. Bede was the greatest scholar of his age, and although there is no record of his travelling further from his monastery at the mouth of the Tyne than to Lindisfarne, he learned all that he needed from correspondents, visitors and his books.

The Irish tradition, diffused through the monks of Iona, was the source of his interest in computistical problems. The date of Easter had been a major point of dispute between the followers of the Roman tradition and the Scots who had arrived from Iona. Bede made his own contributions to the discussion. He shared the interest in scientific questions and in the topography of the Bible shown by the scholars of Ireland and Iona. Since Rome at this period was under the influence of the East as she had not been since the earliest period, with colonies of Greek speaking monks on the Aventine Hill, the appointment of Theodore of Tarsus to be Archbishop of Canterbury was not so surprising as might appear at first sight. Bede had access to Greek exegesis through Latin glossaries which included one by Theodore.

However Bede must be seen, in his exegesis, as a disciple of Gregory the Great. His importance does not lie in the

occasional literal exposition which may be found. It is because he simplified and made available the allegorical expositions of the Fathers. This was what made his work so enormously popular and earned him a place in Mediaeval times among the Fathers of the Church. Although some of the commentaries written towards the end of his life make less use of allegory, it was the allegorical expositions that were most copied and most quoted.

One sign of Bede's attention to scholarship was the way in which he corrected earlier mistakes, for example in the second commentary written on Acts. Since writing his first one he had learned Greek and so was able to point out some of the blunders he had made. Another sign is the use of markings in the margins of the commentaries on the Gospels to indicate the sources from which he had drawn. Claudius and Hrabanus followed the course in some of their commentaries, notably in their commentaries on the Gospels.

After Bede's death, York became the centre of learning and, when Charles the Great wished to find a schoolmaster for his Empire, it was the head of its school, Alcuin, that he chose.

Most of Alcuin's works that have survived were treatises for use in his school, dealing with orthography, grammar and simple logic. There were also theological works and biblical commentaries, which include Interrogationes et Responsiones in Genesim, two hundred and eighty-one questions with suitable, short answers to each. The work is a compilation, using Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Augustine and perhaps Eucherius,

as sources, in order to reply to the questioner, Singvulf.³⁹

A work published in Migne under the name of Bede, Quaestiones in Octateuchum, is attributed to the shadowy figure of Wigbod.⁴⁰ It is a dialogue between teacher and pupil, consisting of a re-editing of material drawn from Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Isidore, Ambrose, Hilary, Junillus, and Eucherius. The convention of dialogue is gradually abandoned, and it is a monologue by the teacher from the beginning of Deuteronomy to the end of the work, copied from Isidore's Quaestiones.

With the works of Alcuin and Wigbod we arrive at the period when Claudius was a student in the town of Lyons. After the palace school this was probably the best place to study. There were ancient libraries which possessed, and still do, works by Origen, Isidore and Bede.⁴¹ There were also many works by Augustine. The Bishop Leidrad encouraged learning and we possess his reply to an enquiry by Charles the Great that describes his educational programme. Then there was the stimulus of working beside others of ability such as Agobard, and Jonas.

One figure stands outside the tradition of scholarship that led to the Carolingian Renaissance in study of the Bible. A commentary on part of Samuel and Kings was written late in the eighth century by a Jewish convert to Christianity. This work, published under the name of Jerome in MPL XXIII, 1391-

39. G. Bardy, Rev. Bibl. XLII (1933), 27-8.

40. MPL XCIII, 233-456; see Bardy, op.cit., 26-7.

41. S. Tafel, "The Lyons Scriptorium" in Palaeographia Latina IV, 40-70.

1470, is a valuable source of Jewish traditions and was used by Hrabanus, in his own commentary on these books. Claudius did not use it, probably because he did not know of its existence. It is possible that he would regard knowledge provided by a Jew, even although converted to Christianity, as tainted.

Chapter Two

In this chapter I shall deal with three topics. Why did Claudius write his commentary? What materials were available to him and how did he make use of these in the composition of the commentary?

The first question might be answered very briefly. He wrote the commentary on Samuel and Kings because a friend of long standing and high dignity, Theutmir, the Abbot of Psalmody in the diocese of Nîmes, had asked him to write one. There was nothing unusual in this request. In response to a similar request, Claudius had already sent a commentary on Leviticus to Theutmir in 823.¹ Claudius' commentary on Galatians had been commissioned by the Abbot Dructeramnus² and the Emperor Louis himself had ordered the commentary on Ephesians to be written.³

However the commentaries written by Alcuin, Claudius, Hrabanus and other scholars of the ninth century were produced not only to please a friend or patron, but to cater for a public that wished to read such books. They were an essential part of the educational programme initiated by Charles the Great. They were schoolbooks for the renaissance of biblical learning, which was to grow from a system of schools attached to churches and monasteries and to the royal courts. Most, if not all, of the teachers and pupils were clerics or monks, and the text-book for higher learning was the Bible.

1. MGH EpKA II, 602.

2. ibid., 596.

3. ibid., 597.

This programme, in which Claudius took his share of the work, was considered at the time to have achieved its object. In a biography of Louis the Pious, under the entry for the year 811 (when Claudius was teaching at the royal residence of Casanorium near Poitiers), we find, "regis autem studio undecunque adductis magistris tam legendi quam cantandi studium necnon divinarum et mundanarum intelligentia litterarum, citius quam credi poterat coaluit".⁴ Leidrad, the Bishop of Lyons where Claudius had received his education, had written to Charles the Great, about the time when Claudius must have been a student, to say that he had carried through a successful programme of training for singers, readers and scholars of the sacred text.⁵

By the middle of the ninth century it was possible for a monastery library to contain a set of commentaries on most of the books of the Bible which had been written during the previous seventy years. In these books extracts from the works of the Church Fathers had been collected together to provide a continuous narrative commenting on the text of a part of the Bible. The Carolingian educational system had equipped scholars, who now, in turn, provided the basic equipment for a wider diffusion of knowledge and a deeper understanding of the Bible and of the Fathers.

There are several explanations why the renaissance was followed by a decline instead of a rise in the level of learning. The general impoverishment of the Empire through

1. MPL CIV, 938.

2. See below, Chapter 3.

internal and external strife must have had some effect on intellectual life. Scholarship requires leisure and peace of mind. It may be also that there was a distinct shift in the interest of the whole Christian community from the lively curiosity and love of knowledge displayed by Alcuin and his master Charlemagne towards the asceticism and credulous piety that are represented by Louis the Pious and his religious adviser, Benedict of Aniane.

However the decline did not set in immediately. The generation of scholars who began their careers after the death of Charlemagne showed greater originality of thought than the generation of their teachers, such as Claudius and Hrabanus. Gottschalk, Ratramnus, Radbertus, Paschasius and John the Scot display in their thinking a maturity and adventurousness that must owe something to the work of their predecessors.

One of the most pertinent criticisms of the work of the Carolingian exegetes is that they were handing on the wisdom of the Fathers at second or third hand. However it must be said in their defence that the Fathers were being offered to the younger generation in a convenient form, with adaptations to make their work more palatable and with some of the obscurities and irrelevances removed. Also, beside the production of the new commentaries went the multiplication of manuscripts of the original works by the Fathers, so that those who wished to read a comprehensive collection of the works of the Fathers were probably freer to do so than had been possible anywhere since the dispersal of Cassiodorus' library at Vivarium about three hundred years before. Much of the learning of the Ancient World had been lost in the Dark Ages

of destruction and barbarism. Very little of the stock of learning that survived until the time of Claudius has been lost in the centuries since. The catenae of the Carolingian period did not supplant the works of the Fathers from which they were drawn. They introduced them to a wider readership.

There was a profound reverence for the works of the Fathers in the early middle ages. When Claudius described Augustine as the "Pen of the Holy Trinity, the tongue of the Holy Spirit",⁶ he was expressing in high-flown language the general belief that the authority of the Fathers was the same as that of the Holy Scriptures. Since the Fathers had revealed the true meaning of the Bible, theirs was the only true and possible interpretation. R. Loewe notes that, "Since the substantial significance of Holy Writ is embodied in its patristic exegesis, it was felt to be desirable that the text itself should show some significant pointer towards that significance".⁷ This belief could have led to tendentious alterations to the text of the Bible to make it correspond with the interpretations given by the Fathers. It was fortunate that Alcuin's revision established a standard text and settled questions of orthography and punctuation. After copies of the new version had been multiplied, Old Latin and regional variations dropped out and new readings could not easily commend themselves to the diligent reader, even where they might seem desirable for theological reasons.

Compilation is not nowadays considered an important task

6. MGH EpKA II, 599.

7. Cambridge History of the Bible II, 139-40.

for a scholar, although M.F. Toal's volumes of "Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers", J. Stevenson's "A New Eusebius" and a multitude of similar works which bring together original sources for the convenience of the non-specialist show that the compilation has its uses at least in some fields. In the Middle Ages of course there was no objection to incorporating the work of others into the body of one's own book, and acknowledgement of this was not considered necessary, or, in some cases, even desirable for reasons of literary style. In an age when there were so few books, the means available for storing and communicating knowledge were so meagre that it would have been foolish to reject what others had already written.

We may even believe too that people of ancient times had some right on their side when they did not acknowledge the sources from which they drew. A statement should be accepted on its own merits, not on the authority of someone else, no matter how distinguished. Recent psychological tests have demonstrated that it is very difficult to judge writing, painting and other arts on their own merits alone. When the work of famous exponents of these arts is attributed to school-children, then it is assessed unfavourably by those asked to examine it; when the work of poor amateurs is presented as the work of experts, then it is considered to be significant and people say they like it.

The commentaries of Claudius are not works of original thought. He set out to provide a catena of extracts from the Fathers, supplemented by a few other ideas that he had worked out for himself. He did not even rephrase the thoughts

of the Fathers in his own words as some of his contemporaries did. From the events of his life and his writings we know that Claudius was a man of independent mind, not afraid of standing alone against severe opposition when he believed he was right. He did not copy the words of others because of his own poverty of mind. In his works of exegesis he was not expressing his own thoughts and opinions, but the mind of the Church as revealed in the work of her greatest sons. In the introduction to the commentary on Samuel and Kings, Claudius described his work as issuing "non ex meo ingenio, sed ex illustrium doctorum iudicio, neque ex propria temeritate, sed ex aliorum auctoritate".⁸ When Hrabanus Maurus wrote his catena on the Epistles of Paul he said that he had found commentaries from the Fathers to cover the whole of the works he was dealing with, and so there seemed to be no need to use his own words at all.⁹

A commentator wrote not to make a reputation for himself but to help in building up the life of the Church. Professor Jones has said that, while Bede wrote for the "rudis lector", later commentators wrote for a learned audience.¹⁰ I can see no trace of the latter attitude in the introductions or the text of Claudius' works. I consider that a better definition of the aim of the Carolingian exegete is to be found in Spicq's characterisation of their works as "ouvrages d'édification qui nourrissent la piété des fidèles de tel

8. MGH EpKA II, 607.

9. MGH EpKA IV, 429-30.

10. Sacris Erudiri XIX (1969-70), 118.

diocèse, des moines et des religieuses de telle abbaye, et des clercs de tel école".¹¹

Although the study of the Bible was seen as an aid to the private devotions of the cleric, it also raised questions of wider importance. When Charles the Great was among his friends he was known to them as "King David". This was not said wholly in jest, since both the King and his clerical advisers saw his royal kingship not primarily in Germanic or Roman terms, but as the continuation of the rule over God's people granted to the Kings of the Old Testament through the prophet Samuel. The nations of the middle ages saw their history, customs and institutions in the light of the Bible.¹²

Scholars who are mainly remembered today for other reasons were best known in the Middle Ages for their works of exegesis. Bede is the most obvious example. Although his Ecclesiastical History and the lives in prose and verse of St. Cuthbert were very popular throughout the whole world of the Western Church, his reputation as the last of the Great Fathers of the Church was solidly based on the biblical commentaries and other aids to the study of the Bible.

The best defence of the works of exegesis produced in the early Middle Ages comes from a radio talk by Professor Southern published in the Listener of 13th February, 1964 (p. 269). Talking of Bede's commentaries, he says, "They are books which we would be glad to read if we had nothing else; they would provide plenty of subjects for reflection,

11. L'Exégèse Latine au Moyen Age, 14.

12. Cf. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, 2nd ed., xi.

a stream of good sense, and (through their quotations) a daily contact with some of the greatest minds of the past. The fact remains that anyone who has other books will probably read these other books. But it was precisely for people who had few other books that Bede wrote".

Scholarship depends on three different kinds of worker; although some people may combine more than one of these functions in themselves. There is the man who by research discovers new information, the man who synthesises new discoveries into a coherent whole, and the teacher who passes on both the elements of knowledge and the will to extend the limits of that knowledge to another generation. Information may lie useless until someone comes forward with a theory linking together the new discoveries. Knowledge may lie dormant or may be confined to a small circle until society as a whole finds it palatable. The genius of the Carolingians lay in popularising the culture and values of Christianity as filtered through the culture of Late Antiquity in Western Europe. The true fruits of their programme of education did not come until the writers of the Glossa Ordinaria completed the task that the Carolingians had begun, as they revitalised the life of the Church and its theology through the study of the Bible. Whether we agree with their programme or not, it has to be admitted that they helped to create a climate of thought that still influences the forms of Christianity in the West from the highest flights of Roman Catholic piety to the imagery in the sermons and songs of fundamentalist sects.

This discussion of the aims of Claudius has wandered far from the simple answer that Claudius wrote his commentary to please a friend. However I do wish to return to immediate aims again for a short space.

We know something of the motives that drove one scholar of the ninth century to write, from the introduction to the commentary on Matthew written by Christian of Stavelot, who was working about fifty years after Claudius. He had twice given a course of oral instruction to his pupils in the monastery of Stavelot, but, finding that they did not yet remember what he had said about the Gospel, he decided to present his material in written form.¹³

The commentaries of Claudius may also have had their origin in sets of lectures delivered either in the Cathedral School at Lyons in the time of Bishop Leidrad, or in the palace schools of Aquitaine and at Aix. In the Introduction to the commentary of I and II Corinthians, Claudius wrote to Theutmir, "I truly state that it was with reluctance that I originally took up both this work and the Pentateuch for which you have asked, when my brethren to whom I was teaching the Scriptures orally (viva voce) as they were gathered together in school demanded them, and when Louis, my pious Prince, was ordering me to do so; I was compelled by that Prince not to hand over my words merely to the wandering forgetfulness (of the mind) but to write them with a pen, so that they might last for a long time - that what I presented

13. MGH EpKA IV, 177.

orally might be written down with a pen".¹⁴

Claudius was the most modest of scholars. He repeatedly apologised for his poor latinity, his lack of success in collecting together sources and his other mistakes; he asked for assistance and correction. The commentaries were issued during the intervals of a busy life in education, church administration and government business. Perhaps he would never have completed his commentaries had there not been pressing demands from friends such as Theutmir. There is no evidence that he ever found time to produce a revised edition of any of his works. He did not write them from any desire for self-aggrandisement. He sought to be a channel by which the thoughts of the Fathers might reach a wider readership. He saw himself as a "peccator" and was conscious of his "paupertas".¹⁵

Claudius wrote because he was asked to do so. He wrote because books were needed, both to popularise the thinking of the Fathers and to explain the meaning of the Bible. His cultural background and theological beliefs determined what sort of book he would write, a catena, and his personal modesty prevented him from dressing it up in a spurious latinity.

The second question that we must ask in this chapter is what materials were available to Claudius as he set about the composition of the commentary on Ruth, Samuel and Kings. Here we come up against one of the fundamental differences between our age and that of Claudius. Today the amount of available

14. MGH EpKA II, 601.

15. ibid., 590, 593, etc.

literature about the Fathers of the Church is immense. I doubt whether anyone could, in the course of a lifetime, read and digest all the articles of scholarly interest about Augustine, to mention only the most important of the Latin Fathers. Our problem today in scholarship is that of retrieving the information that we want from the best or most recent source.

It is difficult for us to appreciate that the greatest scholars of the early Middle Ages had only a very restricted range of books available to them. The Venerable Bede was probably the most learned person of that period. He lived long, in a peaceful and prosperous land, with friends to lend or give him books from many sources. He had the resources of a large monastery behind him. Yet the list of books from which he made quotations does not extend much beyond a hundred and fifty volumes, some of them quite short. Even if we assume that he must have read a number of books to which he did not make reference at a later date, we are still left with the surprising fact that this scholar read no more books in his whole life than would fit into one modest bookcase. He must have wished to obtain copies of other books, although there is only one whose lack he bewailed, as far as I know. That was Paterius' collection of extracts from the works of Gregory the Great.¹⁶

De Ghellinck talks about the "penurie médiévale" of books.¹⁷ Poverty is one of the distinguishing marks of the

16. A.H. Thompson ed., Bede, 236.

17. Patristique et Moyen Age II, 13.

early Middle Ages. The population of Western Europe at the beginning of the ninth century was much smaller than it had been during the Roman Empire. Even the largest towns contained only a few thousand inhabitants; an inefficient farming and husbandry provided a poor living for the peasants and their overlords. There was little to spare for the cultivation of scholarship even in the monasteries and churches.

Claudius was unusually fortunate in spending his formative years in Lyons, where something of the cultural eminence it had possessed as the chief city of Roman Gaul had lingered on. The library of the Cathedral was richly endowed with old manuscripts, and the Bishop, Leidrad, had been the Imperial librarian before his elevation to the see. He was a learned theologian, a good preacher, and a trusted adviser to the government. Claudius began with the advantages of a good education among as many books as were likely to be found anywhere in the Empire of Charlemagne.

He began his writing with the well trodden paths of Genesis, on which both the ancients and near contemporaries such as Alcuin had written, and with St. Matthew, the Gospel par excellence for the Middle Ages. He also wrote on the Epistles of Paul.

Then in 820 he began to work systematically through the early books in the Old Testament, with commentaries on Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, followed by Ruth, Samuel and Kings, and finally Joshua and Judges. There is no commentary on Deuteronomy, because Claudius had said all he had to say about the Law in earlier books.¹⁸ In this stretch of the

18. MGH EpKA II, 609.

Old Testament he might be considered as a pioneer. There was no continuous commentary on any of these books available to him as far as I can tell. He said of Samuel and Kings, "They lack a great interpreter".¹⁹ He had to search out treatises and extracts from longer works and weave them together to create his commentaries.

It is easier to say what materials were not available than to say precisely what were available to Claudius as he began to work on Samuel and Kings. He had no direct access to the treasures of Hebrew and Greek exegesis. All his sources were in the Latin language.

S The Jews of Lyon/ were numerous, prosperous and had influence at the courts of the local count and of the Emperor. There must have been Rabbis among them who were keen students of the Old Testament. There must have been Jews also in Northern Italy when Claudius was living in Turin. Yet there is no trace in the works of Claudius of any Jewish influence. It is true that in the Brevis Chronica attributed to Claudius the author advises anyone who disagrees with his computations to examine the manuscripts of the Jews for information about the chronology of the Old Testament.²⁰ This advice comes straight from Augustine.²¹

There is almost no evidence for contact between Jewish and Christian scholarship in the Carolingian period. A disciple of Theodulf of Orleans collected some Jewish manuscript readings of the Book of Psalms. A short commentary on Samuel and Kings was written by a converted Jew. This was used by Hrabanus and his disciple Angelomus, but not by

19. ibid., 607.

20. MPL CIV, 918.

21. de Civitate Dei XV, 12f; C.C. XLVIII, 468ff.

Claudius.²²

There is no need however to attribute that omission to 'odium theologicum'. Claudius' commentaries contain the commonplaces of reprobation against the Jews (see for example the beginning of his commentary on Ruth), but he did not make violent, personal attacks against them. Agobard, Leidrad's successor as Bishop of Lyons, did write several tracts against the Jews of the city of Lyons, accusing them of stealing Christian children and selling them as slaves and eunuchs to the Moslems of Spain.²³ In his enquiries, Agobard learned something of the Jewish customs and traditions, but obviously did not look to them for help in studying the Bible.

During the Carolingian period contact between the Greeks and Northern Europe was confined to a few diplomatic exchanges between the Courts of the two Emperors, and the tenuous links in church life maintained by the Pope. The Pope wished to remain on good terms with both Courts, but increasingly pressure was put upon him by the barbarians of Northern Europe to make him join them in opposition to the Greeks whom they saw as crafty and effete.²⁴

Greek books seem to have been scarce in the West, and the ability to read Greek was a rare accomplishment. North of the Alps, John the Scot was the only scholar of the ninth century to display real competence in the language. Claudius

22. See Chapter 1.

23. MPL CIV, 75-6.

24. R.W. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 61-7.

of Turin could write a few words in Greek and repeat the interpretations that he found in the Fathers. My first introduction to the name of Claudius of Turin was a reference to his commentary on Galatians in the apparatus criticus of Souter's edition of the New Testament in Greek. This credits Claudius with an importance that he does not merit, since he copied that part of his commentary from Jerome.²⁵

The Greek words that I have found scattered in commentaries, e.g. ἱματίον in the commentary on Matthew V, 40 and λαός, εἶδος and λατρεία in Samuel and Kings were copied in their context from the Fathers²⁶ (λαός taken from Bede's XXX Quaestiones III;²⁷ εἶδος and λατρεία taken from Augustine's De Civit. Dei X, 1.²⁸)

Some works of Greek exegesis had been translated into Latin by Jerome, Rufinus and others. However very few of the Greeks seem to have been interested in Samuel and Kings, and even less was translated. Claudius made use of a homily attributed to Chrysostom on the Apostle Peter and the Prophet Elijah.^{29,30} Its appearance translated into Latin in Claudius' commentary raises a mystery since it does not belong to the collection of thirty-eight homilies which were translated into Latin and used by Augustine and others.³¹

25. Galatians II, 5.

26. MPL CIV, 652.

27. C.C. CXIX, 826.

28. C.C. XLVII, 272.

29. MPG L, 725-36.

30. J.A.de Aldama, Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum, No.314.

31. A. Wilmart, "La Collection des 38 homélies latines de Saint Jean Chrysostome" in J.T.S. XIX (1918), 305-327.

There is also a quotation from Origen at the beginning of Claudius' commentary which follows the Latin translation in Migne's Patrologia Graeca almost word for word.³² This comes from the first homily on the books of Kings.

When Claudius turned his attention to the resources of Latin exegesis, we would expect that he would begin with the four great Fathers of the Western Church, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and Gregory. The earliest of these, Ambrose of Milan, had written four treatises on topics from Samuel and Kings, two on the sin of David and Bathsheba, one on Naboth's vineyard, and one on Elijah and the famine. It is interesting to note that Ambrose, the administrator turned prelate who rebuked the sins of the Emperor himself, should have chosen to speak of prophets who rebuked the sins of the Kings of ancient Israel. Since neither Bede, who showed a long and continued interest in Samuel and Kings, nor Hrabanus used the treatises by Ambrose, I think that it may be taken for granted that these works were unknown in the early middle ages.

It is perhaps more surprising that Claudius did not use part of the commentary on Luke by Ambrose which refers to the story of Ruth, that on Chapter 3, 30-36. The material is of interest, would not have duplicated anything that he had already gathered together for the commentary on Ruth, and we know that the commentary on Luke was known to Claudius since he quoted twice from it in his commentary on Matthew.³³ It

32. MPL CIV, 637D-638D - MPG XII, 1000B- 1001A

33. G. Bofitto, "Il codice Vallicelliano C III" in Atti della Reale Accademia delle scienze di Torino, XXXIII (1898) 250-85.

reminds us that even in those days when few books were available, a man might not be able to make use of information that he had once had available to him, either because that particular volume was no longer in his hands or because he had forgotten its existence.

Ambrosiaster had written briefly about some of the problems of Samuel and Kings in his set of Quaestiones. Although Bardy has noted the use of the set by Alcuin and Smaragdus in their commentaries, I cannot find evidence that Claudius ever made use of it.³⁴

From the works of Augustine came the largest contribution by a single author to the commentary. Two works were used almost entirely by Claudius, and these are the largest of the sources in bulk. The Quaestiones ad Simplicianum deal with five passages from the books of Samuel and Kings. Book Seventeen of the City of God is a history of the Jewish people from the birth of Samuel to the return from Babylon. Passage after passage from this book was placed in the commentary after the appropriate verses from the Bible had been quoted.

Other shorter works by Augustine were used also. II Samuel, XXII is a slightly different form of Psalm XVIII (Psalm XVII according to the numbering in the Latin Bible). Claudius transferred the appropriate section from Augustine's Enarrationes on the Psalms into his commentary, but did not make the changes to the text of the Psalm as used by Augustine

34. G. Bardy, op.cit., 356.



so that it would conform to the text as given in II Samuel.

There is a brief quotation from the de Trinitate,³⁵ another from the de correptione et gratia,³⁶ and another from the de cura pro mortuis gerenda.³⁷ Claudius must have made good use of the collection of the works of Augustine to be found at Lyons.

While Augustine wrote at length about Samuel and Kings, Jerome does not seem to have shown more than a very general interest in these books. Claudius was able to find a few extracts from Jerome's commentaries on Isaiah and Ecclesiastes. However he may not have drawn the passages in the commentary on Ecclesiastes directly from Jerome, since the same extracts that he used can be found in Alcuin's commentary on Ecclesiastes. Then there are references to Jerome's de nominibus hebraicis in Claudius' introduction and to the de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum at 764A in the body of the commentary.

The works of Gregory the Great are so voluminous and so unsystematic that it was fortunate for the scholars of the Carolingian period that there were copies of Paterius' book available to them. This disciple of Gregory had arranged passages from Gregory's works in the order proper to the books of the Bible to which they referred.^{38,39} A brief

35. MPL CIV, 831.

36. ibid., 741.

37. ibid., 743-4.

38. R. Etaix, "Le liber testimoniorum de Paterius" in Rev. des Sciences Relig. XXXII (1958), 66-7.

39. A. Wilmart, "Le Recueil Grégorien de Paterius", Rev. Bén. XXXIX (1927), 86-7.

examination of Claudius' commentary shows that almost every passage of Gregory used in the commentary on Samuel and Kings begins and ends where Paterius' extracts begin and end.

Claudius used about nine tenths of the section of Paterius' book dealing with Samuel and Kings. A few other passages of Gregory's works quoted in Claudius' commentary are not to be found in the Migne edition of Paterius' Liber Testimoniorum. Since the text of Paterius printed in Migne is not reliable, these too may have been drawn from the manuscript of Paterius in Claudius' hands.

One work which consists partly of work by Gregory was not used by Paterius. This is the commentary on I Samuel which consists of notes of lectures by Gregory which were corrected by the monk Claudius of Ravenna. Gregory died before Claudius was able to present the commentary to him for revision, and the work seems to have fallen into almost complete oblivion. It was as unknown to Claudius of Turin as it was to all his contemporaries and survived the Middle Ages in two manuscripts only.⁴⁰

Claudius made use of two sermons by Caesarius of Arles. He may however have believed that these had been written by Augustine since many of Caesarius' sermons were attributed to Augustine in the manuscript tradition.

One source of major importance is the Quaestiones of Isidore of Seville. This was used almost entirely. At the end of the fourth book of Isidore's Quaestiones dealing with

40. P. Verbraken, "Le Commentaire de Saint Grégoire sur le Premier Livre des Rois", Rev. Bén. LXVI (1956), 159-217.

Samuel and Kings comes the one big omission made by Claudius. Sections 4,6,7 and 8 (the last in the book) have been omitted, and 3 and 5 have undergone many changes in wording. Since Claudius did not normally make alterations to the text of his sources except at the beginnings or ends of the passages chosen, I suggest that the manuscript of Isidore used by Claudius must have been corrupt or defective at that point.

Bede's XXX Quaestiones in Regum librum had been suggested by Theutmir of Psalmody as an example of the kind of work he wanted Claudius to write for him in response to his seventy-two questions about Samuel and Kings. Since Claudius did not write the short work requested, but a full length commentary, he incorporated much of the XXX Quaestiones in his work. Questions XI, XII, XIII and XV were all omitted completely and there are a number of other shorter omissions. Most of these have no significance; e.g. a reference to "tuus codex" in Question III was removed by Claudius.

Bede's de Templo was also mentioned by Theutmir and was also made use of by Claudius. A few pages of the de Templo are printed in the edition of Claudius' commentary found in MPL CIV. At column 733 are found the words, "Aedificium in superiore huius voluminis parte habes a beato Beda expositum". This is followed by an extract from another work. The version in MPL CIV is not however the only form in which Claudius' commentary has been printed, since MPL L contains another version attributed to Eucherius of Lyons. This omits the introductory epistles and the appendix at the end of Book IV, but apart from these omissions there is only one

major difference between the two versions. At this point where MPL CIV breaks off, the other version continues straight on to the end of the de Templo, apart from a few omissions. The capitula for Book III, which contains the de Templo passages, are printed in MPL CIV, but not in MPL L. The capitula do however agree with the longer text and are in fact the same as those for Bede's de Templo as printed in the C.C. edition.

P. Bellet⁴¹ considers that the version printed in MPL CIV (the short text) is what Claudius wrote and that someone added the later part of the de Templo to this from a manuscript which belonged to Claudius, who had excised part of the de Templo for dogmatic reasons. (Chapter 21, the longest omission in the Pseudo-Eucherius version, is a defence of image worship.) The evidence would rather suggest that the original text of Claudius' commentary was the long version as found in MPL L, with nearly all of the de Templo. A scribe somewhere began to fill a manuscript with works on Samuel and Kings, and after copying the de Templo continued with Claudius' commentary. After he had copied several pages of the extract from the de Templo, he decided to omit the rest, made a note to that effect in his copy and continued to copy the commentary from the end of the de Templo extract. This shorter text, that found in the Pistoia manuscript which is the source of the printed edition, betrays its origin since the capitula at the beginning of Book III refer to the longer text.

41. op.cit., 219-20.

There is an analogy to this in Claudius' commentary on Matthew. Claudius made use of the whole of Augustine's commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. In all the manuscripts that I have seen except one, Augustine's commentary is copied almost word for word. In the manuscript Vallecelsiana C III of the ninth century the Bible verse and the first sentence of Augustine's exposition of that passage are given and then comes the next Bible verse. In the margin are given the identifying letters AUG to help the student who wished to find the full exposition. In this way several pages of writing would be saved.

As we have seen, Claudius made full use of two works by Bede on Samuel and Kings. A third work, his commentary on I Samuel, seems to have fallen into temporary oblivion during the Carolingian period. There are few manuscripts of it and I can find no evidence of its use by Claudius or Hrabanus.

The final section of this chapter deals with the methods which were used by Claudius and his contemporaries in writing commentaries. Since they were writing catenae consisting of extracts from the Fathers, the first problem was that of collecting together suitable material. As there were no bibliographies or indexes, and there were few concordances, if we may call them such, such as Paterius' Liber Testimoniorum on Gregory the Great, or Bede's collection of comments by Augustine on the Pauline Epistles, the task of collection must have been long and arduous. Alcuin and Hrabanus, on their own admission, had pupils who assisted them.

Claudius said that if his commentary on Matthew was not

as good as it might have been, part of the blame was that it had not been "in tabellis excepta vel scedulis digesta".⁴² I take this to mean that he had no notes or references available to him before he began his own collecting.

He missed some sources that we might have expected him to use, e.g. Ambrose's treatises on Samuel and Kings and Bede's commentary on I Samuel. The other works that he did not use such as the commentary by Gregory the Great do seem to have been extremely rare and little known.

Probably Claudius had some system of marking the manuscripts in his possession to show the scribe who prepared the fair copy which passages were to be copied and which omitted. A study by B. Bischoff has shown how Alcuin marked one manuscript to indicate what had to be copied into a work he was preparing.⁴³ Charlier has shown an even more detailed system used by the deacon Florus of Lyons. Many of the manuscripts of Augustine which were used by Florus to prepare a collectaneum on the Epistles of Paul have survived. There are marks to show the beginnings and endings of the portions which were to be copied into the collection, and markings to show the order in which they were to be written. In the collection itself detailed references were made to the sources from which the passages had been drawn.⁴⁴ The same marking found in other manuscripts can be related to some of the works attributed to Bishop Agobard of Lyons and Charlier believes

42. MGH EpKA II, 595.

43. "Aus Alkuins Erdentagen" in Medievalia et Humanistica XIV (1962), 31-38.

44. "La compilation Augustinienne de Florus sur l'Apôtre", Rev. Bén. LVI (1945-6), 132-86.

that Florus must have assisted his bishop in writing these.

In two cases at least, Matthew and Genesis, the commentaries by Claudius contained marginal markings to show the authorship of each extract. Bede was the first person to use marginal letters in this way, in his commentaries on the Gospels of Luke and Mark.⁴⁵ Alcuin advised Hrabanus to follow the same system.⁴⁶

A manuscript which is the original copy of Claudius' commentary on Genesis is in the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris and is a valuable witness to Claudius' method of working.⁴⁷ The colophon states that it was written by Faustinus at one of the royal palaces of Aquitania.⁴⁸ Most of the manuscript was written in a hand of uniform size. At certain points the writing is much larger or smaller. In some of the latter cases the writing spreads to the margins or is written between the lines of the succeeding passage. It would appear that most of the manuscript was written continuously with gaps left in the appropriate places (according to instructions) to be filled up later with extracts from books not immediately available to Faustinus. When he was able to complete the manuscript he found that he had in some cases left too much parchment, and therefore spread out his writing to fill the space, and in others he had to crowd a long passage into a small space.

45. C.C. ed., CXX 7, 432.

46. MGH EpKA III, 403.

47. Paris B.N.Lat 9375.

48. MGH EpKA II, 593.

When we turn to the commentary on Samuel, Kings and Ruth there are certain conclusions that we can come to about Claudius' methods of working. The arrangement of the contents shows that Claudius planned the work in some detail.

The whole work would appear to have been arranged as follows, although no manuscript contains everything. First comes the letter by Theutmir including a list of seventy-two passages from Samuel and Kings that he wished to have explained to him. Then comes the reply by Claudius offering him a full length commentary. There follows the short commentary on Ruth, the capitula for book one and the text of that book, and the capitula and text of the other three books in order. The books correspond with the divisions in the Bible of I and II Samuel, I Kings and I Kings XII, 20. (I Kings XII is the chapter that begins the story of the divided Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, so the break between Books III and IV comes in a sensible place.) At the end of book four comes another letter by Claudius which is followed by a few pages of "bare questions of literal interpretation" which he did not wish to mingle with the "flowers of allegory" in the main commentary.⁴⁹ This is where Claudius dealt with some of the questions raised by Theutmir, for which no explanation had been offered in the main commentary.⁵⁰

Claudius' usual practice was to quote from one of the Fathers on a particular passage. Where another of the Fathers had discussed the same passage, his discussion might be added

49. ibid., 608.

50. I.e. questions nos. 9,11,30,37 and 38 on 627f. of MPL CIV.

at the end of the first piece of exegesis. I have found no evidence of an attempt at conflation, where two sources or more have been rewritten into a continuous passage. There are cases where blocks from one source have been fitted into another, e.g. Augustine's commentary on Psalm XVIII has been filled out by the passages from Paterius referring to the same verses.

There are alterations to wording but these were kept to a minimum. When I first began this study I believed that the text printed in Migne could not be trusted since the editor Trombelli says in his introduction that he has altered the text of the manuscript used, that in Pistoia, to agree with the published text of the Fathers.⁵¹ Closer acquaintance with the manuscript evidence has shown that Trombelli's work was confined to correction of spelling, punctuation and a few obvious scribal errors.

There is, as I have noted earlier in this chapter, a case where an omission may have been made from the works of Bede for theological reasons. May it be that Claudius, who was writing barely a hundred years after Bede, did not give the same respect to him as he did to the earlier Fathers of the Church? Since Hrabanus omitted the same passage when he came to it in the De Templo, perhaps we should not make too much of this matter.

Claudius chose to write an allegorical commentary, using the works of the Fathers as his sources. He made as

51. MPL CIV, 621.

few alterations as possible to the passages from their works that he selected. A small amount of editorial alteration was needed to connect together some passages and to omit what was unnecessary and Claudius did what was necessary. In dealing with his sources he had three choices open to him. He could have interwoven them into a coherent whole in which he imposed his style and personality upon the sources. This is what Hrabanus did to some extent. He could have quoted each source in turn and made no choice between them, which would have produced an unwieldy, unbalanced and repetitive volume. He did in fact choose the third alternative, selecting what he wanted and rejecting what was irrelevant to his purpose or what he considered had been better said by another.

After working my way through as many conceivable sources as possible, I have found that a number of passages seem to have been written by Claudius himself. One at the end of book four is discussed later along with the Brevis Chronica attributed to Claudius. Others come in the Appendix to book four and are also discussed later. In the main body of the commentary are some historical summaries of linking passages. At its very beginning are a dozen lines of genealogical and geographical data drawn from the book of Joshua.⁵² Similar summaries are to be found elsewhere.

In 782 is the description of the Shunamite woman as a type of the early Church. This passage is composed of the commonplaces of patristic exegesis and may be, like similar

52. MPL CIV, 637.

passages, composed by Claudius from the basic raw materials of typology, rather as one might make up one's own problems in algebra after working through the examples in a school text book.

A number of longer passages have not so far been identified, but almost certainly can be attributed to one of the Fathers. A passage at 706 on the adultery of David and Bathsheba was considered by Trombelli, the editor of the version in MPL CIV, to be by Augustine. I would like to suggest that we may have part of one of the lost homilies by Origen that were available to Cassiodorus. This and other passages which have so far eluded identification are discussed briefly in a later chapter.

Chapter Three

Claudius was one of the most distinguished scholars of the Carolingian period. Because of his piety, learning, and industry he was made a chaplain and teacher at the court of Louis the Pious and later was consecrated bishop of an important diocese. However during his episcopate he became involved in a dispute which not only destroyed the peace of his diocese and lost him old friends but damaged his reputation for posterity.

The sources of information for Claudius' life are not very extensive. The nearest we have to a biography is a few references in works written by his theological opponents, Dungal the Scot and Jonas, Bishop of Orléans. The introductory letters to Claudius' commentaries provide a few names of friends, dates and other details. Then some deductions may be made about Claudius' interests, education and abilities from the commentaries themselves. Of these sources the fullest are the works of his opponents, but since they were written to attack Claudius, they may not be very reliable on some points. It is worthy of note that although Dungal and Jonas accused Claudius of being the disciple of a heretic in his youth and laughed at his poor latinity, they had no criticism to make of his life and morals, or of the quality of his exegetical works.

It was as a scholar of the sacred Scriptures that Claudius made his reputation. The work that Claudius did was either repeated or possibly made use of by those who followed him, including Hrabanus Maurus, the only writer of

the Carolingian period to write more extensively on the Bible than Claudius. Those who came later might be expected to do better and to supersede the work of Claudius. This was all the more likely since Claudius' name fell into disrepute after his death, and he had few disciples to defend his memory.

However manuscripts of his commentaries still survive in some numbers. According to the lists in Stegmüller, which are not complete, there are eight manuscripts of Claudius' commentary on Matthew compared with sixteen of the commentary on the same book by Hrabanus. Commentaries on the Gospels, particularly on St. Matthew, were the most popular of all commentaries. However the number of manuscripts of commentaries on other books of the Bible by Claudius is also roughly half that of the commentaries by Hrabanus. Claudius' commentaries were not driven out of existence by the works of his successors. Some were still being copied four hundred years after they had been written. Sometimes they circulated anonymously or under the names of Eucherius of Lyons or Angelomus of Luxeuil. More often Claudius' name was placed at the beginning of the manuscript.

I believe that Hrabanus has a much higher reputation as an exegete for a number of reasons not directly relevant to the commentaries themselves. In modern times all his works have been available in Migne's edition and since by no means all of the sources from which he drew have been identified the catenistical form that they take is not so obvious as it is in the two commentaries by Claudius that have been published. Hrabanus to some extent disguised his sources by rewriting

them. Claudius quoted his sources with no more editorial amendment than was needed to make sense of what might otherwise be unintelligible. While the rewriting by Hrabanus may unify his work stylistically, it does detract from the commentaries' value as a witness to the texts of the Fathers.

Hrabanus also wrote elementary schoolbooks such as the de Institutione Clericorum which achieved a wider circulation than any of his commentaries did in the middle ages. His reputation as the "praeceptor Germaniae" and as an orthodox churchman has helped to make his name remembered.

In preparing his commentaries, Hrabanus had some advantages over Claudius. He acknowledged the assistance of a number of pupils in the task of collecting material. He also seems to have made use of some at least of the commentaries prepared by Claudius, although he did not admit this. A relationship between the commentaries of Claudius and those of Hrabanus and of his epitomist and disciple Angelomus has been suggested many times. G. Bofitto¹ and A.E. Schoenbach² believe that this can be observed in Claudius' and Hrabanus' commentaries on St. Matthew.

However I have come to the conclusion from a study of the two commentaries on Samuel and Kings that Hrabanus did

-
1. "Il codice Vallicelliana C.III" in Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino XXXIII (1898), 250-85.
 2. "Ueber einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters" in Sitzungsberichte Kais. Akad. Wissenschaften Wien (Phil.-Hist. classe) CXLVI (1903), Abh IV, 90-107.

not make use of Claudius' commentary in the preparation of his own. Since the main sources from which Claudius' commentary are constructed, Augustine, Gregory, Isidore and Bede, were also used by Hrabanus, there is a very strong likeness between the two works. However Hrabanus did not use the rarer sources that Claudius drew upon, such as "Eusebius Gallicanus", Origen, and Chrysostom, nor some of the works by Augustine. He did on the other hand make use of Jerome, Josephus and the "Hebraeus" whom I mentioned in Chapter One. I consider that Hrabanus would have used some at least of the distinctive material found by Claudius if he had known of it. It might be argued that he rejected allegory in favour of more literal sources. I do not think that that is a valid argument since he accepted very happily the allegories of Gregory the Great in his commentary on Samuel and Kings, and in the commentary on Ruth he provided a much more elaborate allegorisation of the material than did Claudius. This also is discussed in Chapter Seven of the dissertation.

There are only two pieces of information about the early career of Claudius. Jonas of Orléans wrote in his de Cultu Imaginum that Claudius was born in Spain and implied that he had been associated with one of the leaders of the Adoptionist heresy that arose in Spain during the eighth century. Elipandus of Toledo had been its founder and one of those who became adherents of this belief was the Bishop of Urgel, Felix. Toledo lay in Moslem hands but Urgel in the Pyrennees was part of the Empire of Charlemagne, who kept a close watch

on church affairs. Since Felix was famous for his piety the heresy began to spread through the south of Charles' territories. Leidrad, the newly appointed Bishop of Lyons, was one of those appointed to meet with Felix to deal with the heresy.

The commission paid a first visit to Urgel in 799 and Felix was persuaded to go to Aix-la-Chapelle that same winter. At a synod held there in the following year the beliefs of Felix were condemned and he was delivered to the custody of Leidrad. Felix was detained in Lyons until his death in 818. During the year 800 Leidrad made a second visit to Spain and to Aquitaine where he preached with great success against Adoptionism. Perhaps he made acquaintance with Claudius on one of the two visits to Spain and brought him back to Lyons.

However, there are other possible reasons why Claudius might have chosen to visit Lyons. At the end of the eighth century the town was still an important crossroads of trade, and had kept something of the reputation that it had held in late antiquity as a centre of culture. Claudius was not the only young Spaniard there. Leidrad's successor as Bishop, Agobard, also came from Spain. Some of the manuscripts from the Cathedral library written in the eighth century show signs of Spanish influence.

Leidrad may have invited these able young men to Lyons either to train them or to use them as teachers in his programme of improvements to his diocese. A letter written to Charlemagne by Leidrad has survived and from this some details of Leidrad's work can be discerned. His chief

interest was in the proper conduct of the services of the church. He had made repairs to the church buildings under his care and had provided the proper vestments and vessels for the conduct of worship. He had revived the schools of church music with the assistance of a singer from the diocese of Metz. Leidrad continued in his letter, "I have now schools of singers and several of them are now so expert that they can teach. I also have schools for readers where they have practice not only in the correct reading of the lessons in the Office but also in arriving at the spiritual sense by study of the Holy Scriptures. Many of my pupils are already able to find the exact sense of the Gospels; others have added the book of Acts; several have been able to reach, at least in part, an explanation of the Book of the Prophets, others the Book of Solomon, the Psalter or Job. Arrangements have also been made for the writing of books."³ I assume that by the last sentence Leidrad meant that a scriptorium had been established at Lyons.

As well as the schools for singing and reading described in Leidrad's letter there must also have been schools for the elementary teaching of Latin. By the end of the eighth century Latin was dying out as a living, spoken language and therefore it had to be taught in schools. There was already in existence a good library to which Leidrad and his successor Agobard made many additions. It was unusually rich in the works of Augustine.

Leidrad, who had been a chaplain with Charles the Great,

3. MGH EpKA II, 543.

was appointed Bishop of Lyons in 798-9. In 814 he retired in favour of Agobard and probably died in the following year, although, when Theutmir wrote to Claudius in 821 or later,⁴ he seemed to imply that Leidrad was still alive.

Agobard, the man that Leidrad had trained and designated to succeed him, left a number of treatises, mostly polemical in nature. He took a leading part in the political life of the time as well as in the practical administration of his diocese and the problems of its people. He was, like most writers of that time, so well versed in the Bible that whenever he wrote he used both conscious and unconscious reminiscences of its language and thought. This language, which seems stilted to modern ears, is the result of the education he had received. Direct quotation from the Bible accounts for about twenty percent of his writings according to A. Cabaniss.⁵ Also he quoted extensively from the Church Fathers, especially from Augustine.

Florus was a deacon at Lyons during the rule of Agobard, and helped his Bishop to write some of his works. He was an able critic and the markings used by him have been discerned on the margins of a number of manuscripts. He took pains to obtain second manuscripts of works to compare with the ones before him. He made a revision of the Psalter and prepared two commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, one consisting of a collection of extracts from the works of Augustine with every reference given as clearly and precisely as possible,

4. ibid., 605.

5. Agobard of Lyons, 10.

and another using extracts from the works of twelve earlier commentators. (The commentary of Florus based on the works of Augustine circulated in the Middle Ages under the name of Bede who had written a similar work.) Florus was also involved in a dispute with Amalarius over the liturgy and the allegorical interpretations of the different parts of the service that Amalarius invented. He may also be the author of the book de Imaginibus Sanctorum attributed in Migne to Agobard.⁶ There is an excursus on this at the end of the chapter.

The scholars of the "school of Lyons", if we may call it such, have certain characteristics in common. They were students of the Bible. Claudius apologised for the poor style of his Latin with the explanation that, "nec saecularis litteraturae didici studium, nec aliquando exinde magistrum habui".⁷ They also shared a wide knowledge of patristic literature and a special love of Augustine. They all possessed a commonsense attitude to the superstitions of that age that we may with some reason attribute to the teaching of their master Leidrad.

A warm affection seems to have grown up between Leidrad and Claudius if Theutmir's letter is to be believed. Probably it was on the recommendation of Leidrad that Claudius was appointed as a chaplain to Louis the Pious some time during the first decade of the ninth century. It would appear that he spent most if not all of his time as teacher of the Scriptures in a school attached to the court. Just as the

6. MPL CIV, 199-228.

7. MGH EpKA II, 603.

royal court moved from one royal residence to another, so it seems that the school would move, either with the court or independently. Claudius referred to two places of residence in his commentaries, one near Poitiers and the other in the Auvergne.

Claudius had already begun to write his first commentary, and perhaps to collect material for his others, when he was in Lyons. Evidence that he began work also on other commentaries may exist in the commentary on Samuel and Kings which was completed more than fifteen years after he had left Lyons. He used the Latin homily by Origen on 1st Samuel, all the extant manuscripts of which can be connected with Lyons.

The first commentary was on Genesis, one of the most popular books of the Bible in those days if we consider the number of commentaries that were written on it. The "original" manuscript of this has survived.⁸ A colophon states that the manuscript was written by Faustinus, a scribe, at the palace of Chasseneuil near Poitiers. Although a detailed dating is given, unfortunately this contains at least one mistake. It is said to have been written in the twenty-seventh year of the reign of Louis the Pious which is 808 A.D. The two other dates given are the year 810 by the reckoning of the Spanish Era and 811 by the Christian Era. There is a further reference to the commentary on Genesis in the commentary on Leviticus completed on the 9th March 823. After mentioning that he had completed the commentary on Exodus two years before, Claudius quoted a few lines from the introduction to that commentary,

8. Paris Nat. Lat. 9575.

now unfortunately lost, including the statement that the Genesis commentary had been completed eight years before it. Allowing that both of these times are approximate, we might date the Genesis commentary from that piece of evidence alone as being written in 810 or 811 at the very outside.

In his discussion of the question of dating, P. Bellet suggested that the most reliable evidence is the reference to the years of the King's reign (which was that used for the dating of official documents).⁹ In view of all the evidence I feel that 810-11 is more likely. Claudius' other works appeared at such frequent intervals that a delay of seven years between his first and second commentaries also seems unlikely.

The commentary was dedicated to an abbot Dructeramnus and Claudius apologised for its defects with his usual modesty. He described his task as that of "gathering together pretty flowers from many fields into one place". Thus the work is a catena, a collection from the works of the Fathers. The introductory letter contains some of the commonplaces of the time. The metaphor of gathering flowers is one, possibly drawn from Alcuin's commentary on Genesis.¹⁰

Claudius stated in the introduction that he intended to expound Genesis in both the literal and spiritual senses. The correct title of the work is Informationum litterae et spiritus in Genesim libri tres, as Bellet has shown.¹¹ Similar

9. P. Bellet, op.cit., 212.

10. MPL C, 743.

11. P. Bellet, op.cit., 213.

titles should be given to the commentaries on Exodus,¹² Leviticus, Numbers, and Samuel and Kings, and perhaps to all of the commentaries that Claudius wrote. The literal sense however does not occupy a large part of the commentary.

Bellet claims to have identified the sources used, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Origen, Isidore, Jerome, and Claudius himself, with the exception of the one source marked 'NCL' in the margin of the manuscript.¹³ Claudius made use of another commentary on Genesis I-IV, 1 which was published by K. Wotke.¹⁴ This was attributed to Claudius by Bellet who considered it must be a first version of the commentary on the whole of Genesis. However, since one of the manuscripts of the work, Autun 27, dates from the middle of the eighth century,¹⁵ this work must be regarded as another of the sources from which Claudius drew his material.

When Charles the Great died in 814, Louis travelled to Aix as supreme ruler of the undivided empire. Claudius went there also and began a period of intense literary activity. As I hope to show in a later chapter, I think that a Brevis Chronica, in which the calculations of dating were made from the Vulgate text of the Bible and not from the Old Latin as had been the practice of most of his predecessors, was written

12. MGH EpKA II, 602.

13. Paris Nat. Lat. 9575.

14. Der Genesiskommentar I-IV, 1 des Pseudoeucherius im Codex Augiensis CXCI Saec X.

15. E.A. Lowe, Codices Latini Antiquiores, VI, no. 728.
M.C. Diaz y Diaz, Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi Hispanorum I, 105.

by Claudius in 814.

The commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel was completed and dedicated to the Abbot Justus in 815. This commentary, like all the others that Claudius wrote, is composed of extracts from the works of the Fathers. In it he followed a practice begun by Bede in his commentaries on Luke and Mark, a practice which was recommended by Alcuin to his pupils. In the margin opposite the quotation from each author was placed a letter or group of letters to identify the author. Claudius used this system in the commentaries on Genesis and Matthew, although only one manuscript of the Matthew commentary to my knowledge contains the markings.¹⁶

In the same year came the commentary on Galatians dedicated to Dructeramnus. In 816 Claudius dedicated his commentaries on Ephesians and Philippians to the Emperor Louis himself. The commentary on Romans cannot be dated but probably comes from the same period. The dedication has not survived. The introduction is in praise of Augustine, the "calamus Trinitatis, lingua Spiritus sancti".¹⁷

Claudius probably wrote commentaries on all of the Pauline Epistles and P. Bellet has suggested that the commentaries on Colossians, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews attributed to Atto of Vercelli are the work of Claudius.¹⁸ In the year 820 Claudius sent to his friend Theutmir, the Abbot of

16. Rome, Vallicelliana C III.

17. MGH EpKA II, 599.

18. "Oració di Claudi di Torí en el comentari a Hebreus del Pseudo Attó de Vercelli" in B. Fischer and V. Fiala edd., Colligere Fragmenta, Festschrift Alban Dold, 140-3.

Psalmody in the diocese of Nîmes, a commentary on I and II Corinthians.

However Claudius had by this time been appointed by Louis as Bishop of the diocese of Turin, perhaps in the year 816. Italy gave Louis and his advisers a good deal of trouble in the early part of his reign. Turin was an important see as it included the Mt. Cenis pass, the main channel of communication between Italy and the rest of Louis' Empire. The monastery at Novalesa on the Italian side of the pass was given many gifts by the Carolingian monarchs in return for the maintenance of a hospice on the pass.

In 817 and 818 there took place the revolt led by the young King of Italy, Bernard, against his uncle Louis. Anselm of Milan and Wulfold of Cremona were among the Bishops involved in the insurrection as well as Theodulf of Orléans and many of the counts and other nobility on both sides of the Alps. There is no record of any part taken by Claudius in the suppression of the revolt, but he may well have played an important role. If he did not take an active part in fighting for Louis, it was certainly not from pacifist scruples or because he liked a quiet life.

In 820, writing to Theutmir, he said that he had no leisure for study. As well as performing his diocesan duties he was engaged in imperial service during the winter, acting with others as the Emperor's "Missi" to try lawsuits and examine the administration of different parts of the country. Then from the middle of Spring, armed with paper and pen as well as the sword, he accompanied the army defending the coastline against raiding parties of Moors and Arabs.

Louis must have been glad to send to be bishop of Turin a man of vigour who was personally loyal to him. However the Pious Louis was more concerned about the souls of his subjects than the safety of his throne when he sent Claudius to Italy. Jonas of Orléans gives as the reason for Claudius' appointment that, "he possessed great experience in the exposition of the Gospel pericopes and was to impart the comfort of sacred doctrine to the Italian people who had largely lost the power of understanding the writers of the Holy Gospel".¹⁹

With the same intention, of raising the level of education among clergy and people, Louis sent Dungal the Scot in 825 to head the school at Pavia. An edict, issued by Lothair as King of Italy, provided for the establishment of nine schools in the Regnum including one at Turin.²⁰ Even so it must be admitted that "la rinascenza carolingia dell' erudizione ecclesiastica ebbe pochissimo effetto in Italia".²¹

Claudius continued to write commentaries. In 821 was published the commentary on Exodus, which has not survived, and in 823 came Leviticus. The commentary on Numbers dates from this period also but has also not survived.

However Claudius had already become involved in a dispute which must have been taking up much of his time and energy, and which was to prove even more burdensome from that

19. MPL CVI, 306.

20. MGH Legum II, 1, 327.

21. D.A. Bullough in ed. M. Macarrone, Vescovi e Diocesi in Italia nel medioevo, 112.

time onwards. This dispute concerned the place of images in the life and worship of the Church.

From the days of the early Church there had been christian pictures. Wealthy Romans whose palaces were decorated with frescoes employed pagan artists to decorate the walls of the catacombs with suitable pictures. In the Catacomb of Priscilla is a fresco of Jesus as the good shepherd surrounded by his sheep. The painting is the representation of christian doctrine in visual terms, but the artist has made no attempt to paint a portrait of Jesus or even to paint an overtly religious picture. The same fresco could have adorned the home of a pagan as part of a scheme of decoration. If there were a tag from Virgil beside it, one would consider it an illustration from the pastoral scenes of his poetry.

On the stone sarcophagi of the third and fourth centuries are to be found overtly christian symbols and pictures of suitable stories from the Old and New Testaments. Among those most commonly chosen are the raising of Lazarus and the story of Jonah. These images were visual aids to comfort the bereaved by reminding them of the christian belief in resurrection.

It was in the sixth century that church leaders first began to complain of the abuse of visual images. Some Christians were paying reverence to paintings of the saints. Two solutions were offered. One was to destroy the pictures in the churches, or at least to remove them. The other was to educate the congregation in the true faith, so that they would, of their own accord, abandon their practices. Gregory the Great advocated the second of these policies in his

correspondence with Serenus of Marseilles,²² who had removed images from his churches.

Throughout that period and during the Middle Ages the worship of images was not a matter of fundamental importance to the Church in Western Europe. It might be said that the Christians of the West were so concerned about relics that they had little interest in images. Bede, who was in many ways a typical believer of the Early Middle Ages, showed a superstitious awe of anything that had touched the body of a saint. Pictures however, such as the series which adorned the walls of the church at Wearmouth, were merely memorials. They moved Bede deeply but they had no power in themselves. There is no mention in his works, as far as I have seen, of a miracle wrought by a picture.

The first occasion in Western Europe when there was lengthy discussion of the place of images occurred in the reign of Charlemagne.²³ In the Byzantine Empire the Iconoclastic Controversy was at its height. Pope Hadrian had concurred in the decree of the Council of Nicaea in 787 which said that images were to be permitted in churches and that they were to be given veneration, but not worship, since God alone was to be worshipped. The Pope sent a copy of the decree of the Council to Charlemagne to inform him of what the Ecumenical Council had decided. However Charlemagne, his clerical advisers and the bishops of the Frankish Church

22. MGH Ep. II, 195.

23. For a summary of the dispute in the West see E.J. Martin, A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy, 222-61.

were not satisfied with the decisions. At a council held at Frankfurt in 794 the veneration of images was condemned and the decrees of the Council of Nicaea were repudiated. The Libri Carolini were written by one of Charlemagne's advisers, probably Alcuin, to instruct the Pope in theology. Although Hadrian probably believed that the Greeks were better theologians, he relied on the military power of the Franks to maintain his position in Rome. Therefore he bowed to the will of his political masters and likewise repudiated the decrees of the Council of Nicaea.

For almost fifty years nothing was to be heard of the dispute about images in the West. Then in the year 824 Louis the Pious called a synod at Paris. The theological positions assumed there were the same as those of the Council of Frankfurt. Images were useful as memorials, but should not be adored. There was one new statement, that the symbol of the cross might be given veneration.

Although no direct connection has been discovered, the decrees of the Council of Paris may contain echoes of the dispute in which Claudius had become embroiled. When Claudius had arrived in Turin in 816 he found images, some of them of great antiquity, in the churches of his diocese. "Since everyone was worshipping them I undertook singlehanded to destroy them," said Claudius. "Everyone thereupon opened his mouth to curse me, and had not God come to my aid, they would doubtless have swallowed me alive."²⁴

After some time rumours of the dispute began to reach his

24. MGH EpKA II, 610.

friends on the other side of the Alps. By then Claudius had begun to attack, not only the worship of images, but all kinds of worship other than that offered to God himself. He had ordered the removal of crosses from the interiors of the churches,²⁵ had deleted the names of the Saints from the prayers of the church and had given up the commemoration of Saints' Days as vain and useless.²⁶ Since the collection of relics, pilgrimages and the worship of the cross were becoming more and more popular in the ninth century, Claudius was recoiling into a primitive orthodoxy at a time when the expressions of piety that were to dominate the Middle Ages were being formed.

Theutmir, a close friend and possibly a former pupil of Claudius, had been the dedicatee of several of Claudius' commentaries. Theutmir submitted the most recent of these, on I and II Corinthians, to the judgement of a synod at Aix. At about the same time he sent a letter to Claudius asking him for a commentary on Leviticus and for a set of quaestiones explaining seventy two passages from the books of Samuel and Kings.

The commentary of Leviticus had already been dispatched to Theutmir and Claudius had almost completed the commentary on Ruth, Samuel and Kings before Claudius discovered the duplicity of Theutmir. Claudius added an angry letter before the appendix to the main commentary on Samuel and Kings, accusing his former friend of treachery and hoping that God

25. MPL CVI, 310.

26. MPL CV, 528.

would punish him according to his deserts.²⁷

Within the commentary there are at least two places that may have been influenced by Claudius' views on the veneration of images. A short passage in praise of images was omitted from the portion of Bede's de Templo which was copied by Claudius.²⁸ Perhaps this is not an important point since the same passage was omitted by Hrabanus and by Angelomus in their commentaries on Samuel and Kings. However they both shortened Bede's de Templo drastically, abbreviating it by at least one third, while Claudius omitted nothing but the first chapter and a few lines in other places apart from the passage on images.

In the appendix there is a bitter attack on the worship of images.²⁹ From the slightly contemptuous reference to Theutmir at the beginning of it one might assume that this was written after Claudius had learned of what Theutmir had done.

The accusations made against Claudius were that he had attacked the worship of images and of the cross, belief in the intercession of the Saints, papal supremacy and pilgrimages to Rome.³⁰ Claudius was asked to come to Aix so that his beliefs might be examined by a council of bishops. He refused to go, dubbing the council a "synod of asses".³¹ Instead, to

27. MGH EpKA II, 608-9.

28. de Templo II in C.C. CXIX A, 212-3

29. MPL CIV, 825-7.

30. MGH EpKA II, 610-3.

31. MPL CV, 529.

explain what he had done Claudius wrote a book, his Apologeticum atque Rescriptum Claudii Episcopi adversus Theutmirum Abbatem. In it he denied only one of the charges laid against him. He had said that pilgrimages were neither a help nor a hindrance to religious life.

Unfortunately all that remains of the Apologeticum is the collection of extracts made at the command of Louis the Pious which was sent for refutation to Dungal the Scot, a famous scholar, and to Jonas, Bishop of Orléans. These extracts are to be found in a manuscript at the Vatican³² and within the works written by Dungal and by Jonas. According to E.J. Martin a manuscript of the complete work was extant in the monastery at Bobbio in 1481 and apparently as late as 1608 a manuscript of it was known to Papirius Masson, the editor of the works of Dungal.³³

The original work is said to have been as long as the Book of Psalms and fifty psalms more.³⁴ The extracts occupy less than four pages of the appropriate volume of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica. However if we may judge from these surviving extracts, Claudius parted company from the beliefs of his fellow bishops in his radical rejection of all visible religious symbols and material aids to devotion. The opinion generally held in the Frankish Church of the early ninth century was that images were permitted as visual aids to devotion but were not to be regarded as anything more than

32. Vat Reg. Lat. 200, ff.1-6v.

33. op.cit., 264.

34. Ms. Vat Reg. Lat. 200 quoted in MGH EpKA II, 613.

memorials. There had been no development of thought since Bede.

To show the contrast between the views of Claudius and his less radical colleagues, I shall compare some sections from the Apologeticum with passages from the Liber de Imaginibus Sanctorum attributed to Agobard or to Florus.³⁵ Although less extreme in his condemnation of the worship of images than Claudius, the author of the de Imaginibus wrote, "If those who have abandoned the worship of devils are permitted to venerate the likenesses of the saints, they would, I think, not so much have abandoned their idols as merely [to] have exchanged one image for another."³⁶

The author of the de Imaginibus said that the representation of the cross was permitted, but not the crucifix, a form of art that was still rare in the ninth century. "Oh how sincere is the religion whenever the banner of the cross, not the likeness of the human face, is depicted".³⁷ In contrast to that Claudius wrote, "If they wish to adore all wood fashioned in the shape of a cross, then it is fitting for them to adore many other things that Jesus did in the flesh. He hung on the cross scarcely six hours, but he was in the Virgin's womb... nine months and six days. Let virgin girls therefore be adored because a virgin gave birth to Christ. Let mangers be adored because he was laid in a manger. Let old rags be adored because as soon as he was born he was wrapped in old rags...".³⁸

35. For authorship see the excursus at the end of this chapter.

36. MPL CIV, 215.

37. ibid., 215.

38. MGH EpKA II, 611-2.

Claudius also spoke of "saints who in vain give themselves divine prerogatives".³⁹ Although the extracts which have survived do not contain any explicit condemnation of the cult of relics, there can be little doubt that Claudius rejected that also. Claudius abandoned the celebration of Saints' Days. His contemporaries Angilbert and Einhard were making collections of relics of the Saints and housing them in great new pilgrimage churches.

For Claudius the apostles were examples to be followed, not intermediaries whose blessing was to be implored. After a quotation from his revered Augustine, Claudius wrote that no one could be saved who did not possess the same faith, righteousness and truth which made the apostles pleasing to God.⁴⁰

True worship must be in spirit and must be expressed in a life of obedience. "God commanded them to bear the cross, not to adore it; they wish to adore what they are unwilling to bear, either metaphorically or literally (*nec spiritaliter nec corporaliter*)".⁴¹ These "worshippers of false and superstitious religion" concentrate their attention on the crucifixion and not on the ascended and triumphant Christ. They worship Christ "after the flesh".⁴²

Thus Claudius contrasted the religion of a worship directed to God alone with dependence on the intercession of

39. *ibid.*, 611.

40. *ibid.*, 613.

41. *ibid.*, 612.

42. *ibid.*, 611.

saints and the use of visual aids to devotion. He tried to undercut the position of his enemies by showing that their religion was unspiritual and unbiblical. His appeals to reason, to the best traditions of the Early Church and to the Bible fell on deaf ears. When his opponents appealed to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, Claudius said that the "apostolicus" is not the man who sits in the apostle's chair, but the man who fulfils the functions of the apostle.⁴³

The brief extracts from the Apologeticum that have survived may give us a distorted view of what Claudius really believed. However the extracts are long enough to show that Claudius had read the works of Augustine with profit. His theology gave primacy to a living relationship with the living God, expressed in a life of ethical decision and in service to others. This is in contrast to the religious practices which were being promoted by many of his contemporaries, which relieved the individual of responsibility for ethical decisions by telling him to rely on the actions and intercessions of others, i.e. the Saints, and deprived him of first hand religious experience.

The arguments of Claudius did attract some disciples to him, as Jonas of Orléans tells us, but they did not commend themselves to many in succeeding generations. Jonas said that Claudius had been appointed bishop of Turin to "impart the comfort of sacred doctrine to the people of Italy".⁴⁴ However the current of Italian religious belief

43. ibid., 613.

44. MPL CVI, 306.

continued to flow in another direction in spite of his teaching. Claudius' contemporaries thought that the reverence paid to images was something that would fade away with better education in Christian belief. Claudius saw more clearly than they did that the craving of ordinary people for material aids to devotion would progressively corrupt the worship of the Church.

Although Claudius had to endure the public condemnation of his views and the loss of friends, he remained in undisturbed occupation of the diocese of Turin. He also continued to prepare and publish his commentaries. In 825 or 826 appeared the commentaries on Joshua and on Judges. They were issued without a dedication. The preface indicates the loneliness and frustration that the dispute about images had brought to Claudius.

Dungal published his attack on Claudius in 827 or 828, by which time he had become the teacher in charge of the court school at Pavia.⁴⁵ He approved the use of images as part of the furnishings of a church, but did not believe that these should be venerated. The most interesting feature of his work is the extensive use made of quotations from the Christian poets including Prudentius, Fortunatus and Paulinus of Nola, all of whom had written poems in praise of martyrs and saints. What had perhaps seemed poetic licence in earlier ages had become accepted belief by the ninth century. A second work by Dungal against Claudius, as yet unpublished, is said to be in the Ambrosian Library in Milan.⁴⁶

45. MPL CV, 465-530.

46. Milan, Ambros. B 102 Sup.

Jonas began to write at the same time as Dungal, but for unknown reasons laid the work aside for many years. He did not complete it until 840, long after Claudius' death.⁴⁷ Jonas' avowed reason for publishing it then was that disciples of Claudius were actively promoting his teachings, and it is possible that some continued to do so for some time more. The arguments brought forward by Jonas were expressed with greater urbanity but were very similar to those of Dungal.

The last reference to Claudius as still alive is the mention of his presence at a lawsuit between the monastery of Novalesa and a group of their tenants at Oulx. The case was tried in May 827 and Claudius' name was appended as a witness to the judgement together with those of Ratpert, the Count of Turin, Isembert, the Emperor's (i.e.? Lothar's) chaplain and others.⁴⁸ There is no evidence of the date of Claudius' death, but it must have been soon after that since his successor, Vitgaire, is listed among the witnesses to a "partage des biens" of the abbey of Saint Denys on 22nd January, 832.⁴⁹

Excursus

The de Imaginibus Sanctorum

In the manuscript⁵⁰ which contains almost all of the works of Agobard is to be found a short book entitled

47. MPL CVI, 305-88.

48. C. Cipolla, Monumenta Novaliciensia, 77.

49. J. Mabillon, de Re Diplomatica, 2nd ed., 519.

50. Paris, Nat. Lat. 2853.

de Imaginibus Sanctorum.⁵¹ The editors attributed it to Agobard on the basis of a colophon stating, "finit de picturis Agobardus Episcopus". The de Imaginibus has been considered by Roman Catholic scholars to be of doubtful orthodoxy, although the author of the article on Agobard in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique⁵² defends it.

The work is a catena of extracts from the Fathers joined together by brief sections in which the author puts forward an interpretation of these passages. His argument is intended to prove that images are permitted and indeed have a rightful place in the life of the Christian Church, but that they are in no way to be adored or given a position of veneration. The patristic quotations used to support that view include twelve passages from the de Civitate Dei, quotations from another five works by Augustine and also from works by Gregory the Great, Leo, Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome, Avitus of Vienne, Bede and others.

The work has close links with the church of Lyons in the early ninth century; these include the external evidence of the manuscript in which it was found and other manuscript evidence discussed later in this section. It also contains features which are typical of the scholarship of the 'school of Lyons'. These include hostility to all forms of popular superstition, a reverence for Augustine, a wide knowledge of his and of other patristic works, and an exact scholarship

51. ed. by P. Masson (Paris, 1605) and E. Baluze (Paris, 1666). Baluze's edition is to be found in Migne, MPL CIV, 199-228.

52. J-B. Martin in Vol. I, 613-5.

which returns as far as possible to original sources, and which takes not only content but context into consideration in the discussion of passages from earlier works.

The arguments in favour of the de Imaginibus being an authentic work of Agobard are that it comes in the one manuscript which contains his authentic works and that the explicit attributes it to him. However other works in the manuscript have been attributed to the deacon Florus by modern scholarship. All the authentic works of Agobard contain an introduction or dedication. The de Imaginibus contains neither, and no links can be traced between the de Imaginibus and the authentic works, either in thought or in language.

If Agobard is denied authorship, then what candidates can offer better claims? C. Charlier⁵³ suggested that Florus might be the writer of this as he undoubtedly was of some of the other works attributed to Agobard. Florus, a younger contemporary and faithful disciple of Agobard, was an outstanding scholar of the period. In his works he gave references to the sources from which he drew extracts with great care and exactness, just as did the author of the de Imaginibus.

In a number of manuscripts known to have been in Lyons in the first part of the ninth century are to be found markings which indicated to a scribe where he was to begin to copy and where to finish and in what order he was to place the extracts

53. Mélanges Podécharde, 80 and "La compilation Augustinienne de Florus sur l'Apôtre" in Rev. Bén. LVII (1947) 132-86.

from the work contained in that manuscript. Many of these extracts have been traced by Charlier to the florilegium on the Epistles of Paul made by Florus from the works of Augustine, and Dom Charlier was able to show that these markings were made by Florus himself. Other markings of exactly the same type indicate extracts which are to be found in the de Imaginibus. Since no other writer has been found who used the same system of markings as Florus then the conclusion seems almost inescapable that Florus must be regarded as the author of the de Imaginibus.

P. Bellet questioned the proposed attribution in an article.⁵⁴ His answer to Charlier's suggestion was that the manuscript markings were to be regarded as a device used by all the writers of the 'school of Lyons' rather than as a special invention of Florus. As Bellet pointed out, Agobard, Claudius and Florus were all Spaniards who spent their formative years in the same environment at Lyons under the guidance and inspiration of Bishop Leidrad, the former librarian of Charlemagne. Perhaps the origin of the markings should be traced back to Leidrad or to Claudius?

There is moreover a very close connection between the de Imaginibus and Claudius' Apologeticum apart from the fact that they both deal with the subject of the veneration of images. All that is known to survive of the Apologeticum is a set of extracts made at the command of the Emperor Louis

54. "Il Liber de Imaginibus Sanctorum bajo el nombre de Agobardo de Lyon, obra de Claudio de Turín" in Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia XXVI (1953), 151-94.

and sent to Dungal the Scot and Jonas of Orléans for their refutation. The extracts are to be found in their works⁵⁵ and in a manuscript.⁵⁶ Seven of the shortest extracts can be related to passages from the de Imaginibus.

In most cases there is an exact correspondence between the words of the passage in the Apologeticum and the passage in the de Imaginibus. On the evidence of these passages there can be little doubt that one work is dependent on the other or that both are dependent on a common source. The passages in the de Imaginibus concerned are not named by the author as coming from an earlier source, and as I noted earlier, the author is unusually careful to show where he draws his material from. From the position that they have in the de Imaginibus one would expect these passages to be the work of the author himself. They appear to be, not quotations, but comments by the author on the quotations he has chosen.

Bellet continued his argument by pointing out that there is no indication from any other source that either Agobard or Florus concerned themselves with the dispute about images. However Claudius did write a work on that subject, the Apologeticum. From the descriptions of the Apologeticum given in the works of Jonas and Dungal, Bellet concluded that it consisted of an introduction, three books and a conclusion. The first book dealt with the veneration of images, the second with the veneration of the cross, and the third with

55. Dungal, Liber adversus Claudium Taurinensem in MPL CV, 465-530 and Jonas, de Cultu Imaginum in MPL CVI, 305-88.

56. Vat. Reg. Lat 200, ff. 1-6v.

the intercession of the saints, pilgrimages to Rome and the jurisdiction of the Pope.

Bellet suggested that the de Imaginibus was the first book of the Apologeticum, which had become separated from the rest of the work. Since the Apologeticum was longer than a copy of the Book of Psalms, the de Imaginibus would certainly be about the right length to be Book One.

The theory of Bellet is attractive and possesses very strong evidence in its favour. However it is worthy of note that Bellet was not the first to see the parallels between the extracts from the Apologeticum and the de Imaginibus. E. Duemmler had already indicated the relevant passages in his edition of the letters of Claudius,⁵⁷ but did not draw any conclusions from them. Since the passages paralleled in the de Imaginibus are among the least striking and distinctive of the excerpts from the Apologeticum, perhaps Duemmler thought that it would be unwise to place too much emphasis on them. The other passages from the Apologeticum are much more vehement in their denunciation of the worship of images. The de Imaginibus is a much more moderate and balanced work than one would have expected from the pen of Claudius.

The passage in praise of images from Bede's de Templo which was omitted from Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings was quoted with approval in the de Imaginibus.⁵⁸ The letter from Gregory the Great to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles

57. MGH EpKA II, 610-3.

58. MPL CIV, 216-7; from Bede's de Templo II in C.C. CXIXA, 212-3.

(wrongly described as the Bishop of Fréjus) is also mentioned approvingly.⁵⁹ The argument of the book is that images are useful and are to be permitted in church. They should be destroyed⁶⁰ when worship is being offered to them. The tone of the work suggests that the issue is more one of academic interest than of vital importance, as it undoubtedly was to Claudius. If we consider the de Imaginibus as representing the considered beliefs of Claudius then we must accept that he was not an iconoclast.

Bellet continued his study by considering the opinions expressed by the author of the de Imaginibus on some of the other disputes associated with the name of Claudius. Since the author recognised the value of the intercession of the saints, venerated their relics and considered the cross as the greatest symbol of the Christian faith, Bellet therefore attributed these views to Claudius.⁶¹ Bellet suggested that the extracts from the Apologeticum which appear to teach the opposite must have been distorted or taken out of context and that the statements by Jonas and Dungal which appear to confirm these were motivated by odium theologicum.

If the de Imaginibus is part of the Apologeticum then Claudius did not hold the views usually attributed to him on the evidence of the extracts from his own works and on the statements of his opponents. While falsification and exaggeration of Claudius' views would undoubtedly have

59. ibid., 217-8.

60. ibid., 218.

61. op.cit., 189.

occurred in the course of the dispute, I find it hard to believe that the amount of these would be as great as required by the theory of Bellet.

There is a section of Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings which presents Claudius' views about images.⁶² In it he condemns the veneration of images and of the saints. There is no evidence from that passage or from anywhere else in Claudius' works that I know of to show that Claudius disapproved of images as aids to devotion. What does appear is that Claudius believed that it was not possible to place images in churches without these images being given veneration. If we may judge from later developments Claudius was correct in his belief.

One must still try to find an explanation for the correspondence between some of the passages from the Apologeticum and the de Imaginibus. Might not Claudius have asked Florus to collect together patristic material so that he might write his Apologeticum? There is some evidence given by Charlier to suggest that Florus helped Agobard to compose some of his works.⁶³ If one may judge the character of Florus from his devotion to the exiled Agobard, it would be natural for him to give all the help he could to a friend who was facing powerful and obscurantist opposition. It does not seem likely that Florus would have used Claudius' Apologeticum in the preparation of his own work on images.

62. MPL CIV, 825-7.

63. see n. 53.

Chapter Four

In this chapter three topics will be dealt with, viz., the manuscripts of Claudius' commentary on Ruth, Samuel and Kings, the printed editions, and modern works which discuss important aspects of the commentary. Since capitula provide valuable evidence for the establishment of the correct text of part of the commentary, I have included an extended note on the origin and development of the system of capitula.

1. Manuscripts

Seven manuscripts must be described. However the first thing that must be said is that not one of these contains all of the commentary together with the introductory letters and the appendix. This may seem surprising. The best explanation, in my opinion, is that the commentary was regarded as a school text, not a literary work. Only one of the manuscripts could be regarded as a de luxe product. Two have reached us in a damaged condition. All appear to have suffered from or are descended from manuscripts which suffered from alterations made by scribes to suit their particular needs or to save scarce and expensive parchment.

The manuscripts are described in chronological order as far as this can be ascertained.

V Vienna, Oesterreiches Nationalbibliothek 710 of the tenth century.

This manuscript is of unknown provenance. It consists of 56 folii written in two columns. It contains the commentary on Samuel and Kings omitting the introductory letters, the commentary on Ruth and the capitula to Bk I. The manuscript now ends abruptly in the middle of a sentence about half way through Bk III of the commentary. At the top of the first page is a note in a hand of the Renaissance or later (only partly legible in the photograph I have received),

"Eucherii Lugdunensis Episcopi ...

N 688..."

The contents are as follows:

f. 1r "Regum successiones post iudices quando..."

20v-21r capitula for Bk II

34r capitula for Bk III

"in timore Dei. Factum est igitur..." i.e. long text of the de Templo

56v the text ends at the foot of the page with the words, "prius completa. Nisi forte putandum est post" i.e., MPL L, 1136b; Bede, de Templo II (C.C. CXIX A, 197, line 228).

I am indebted to the staff of the Nationalbibliothek for the above information and for photographs of the beginning and end of the manuscript. See also below on ms Zwettl 89.

P Pistoia, Biblioteca Capitolare 96 of the eleventh century.

This is also of unknown origin. It consists of 159 folii of 225 x 180 mm trimmed from a larger sized page since some marginal notes in a later hand have been partly cut off. The manuscript contains the introductory letters and the commentary on Samuel and Kings including the appendix. It is written in single columns to a page except for the capitula to Bede's XXX Quaestiones which were incorporated in Theutmir's letter, and the capitula to Bks I, III, and IV of the commentary which are in double columns. There are illuminated capitals at the beginning of each section of the work and the capitals at the beginnings of some paragraphs of the book are in red.

f. 1r "Amabili magistro domino Claudio...";

Theutmir's letter

7v "Compellit et constringit..."; Claudius' reply

9r capitula for Bk I

48v capitula for Bk II

72v capitula for Bk III

81v "in timore Dei. Aedificium in superiore huius voluminis parte habes a beato Beda expositum."

i.e. the short text of the de Templo

87v capitula for Bk IV

140v "Quia igitur iam fautore Deo..."; Claudius' second letter

141r "De eo quod scriptum est; vultus eius..." the appendix to the main commentary in the form of quaestiones

159v "atque Semaam non pervenerat." i.e. no XX of the quaestiones as numbered by Trombelli (in MPL CIV, 819) was placed at the end of the manuscript. Trombelli conjectured (correctly as can be seen from the other two mss of the appendix, M and N) that the quaestio had been omitted from its proper place by mistake.

This is the manuscript from which Zaccharia and Trombelli made their editions. It was also used by the editor of the edition of the introductory letters in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica¹ together with M.

A leaf added to the first gathering of the manuscript gives the title "XXX Quaestiones super libros Regum; id est catena patrum". This is in a hand later than the manuscript and is the source for the title as given in printed editions.

My information is based on personal examination of the manuscript.

M Mantua, Biblioteca Comunale C.V.2 of the eleventh century

This manuscript formerly belonged to the monastery of San Benedetto di Po.² It contains 134 folii written in double columns. Claudius' commentary occupies the second half of the ms.

f. 61a Claudius' commentary on Ruth

62d Theutmir's letter

65c Claudius' reply

1. MGH EpKA II 605-9.

2. B. de Montfaucon, Diarium Italicum, 29.

- 66b capitula for Bk I
- 83d "Promissiones Dei..." text of Bk II
- 84c capitula for Bk II followed by "Post mortem Saul..." (MPL CIV, 692)
- 95c capitula for Bk III
- 100a "in timore Dei. Aedificium templi in superiore... expositum". i.e. the short text of the de Templo as in P.
- 102d capitula for Bk IV
- 127c Claudius' second letter
- 127d the appendix in the form of quaestiones
- 134d the text ends with "vero tabernaculo semper introibantSa". i.e. MPL CIV, 834b. The last twenty lines of the Migne edition have been lost.

This manuscript and P were collated for the edition of the introductory letters in MGH.

My information is based on personal examination of the ms in 1965.

Z Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek 89 of the twelfth century

This contains Augustine's Confessions, Angelomus' Commentary on Genesis and other briefer works as well as Claudius' commentary. This has been given the title, "Expositio Angelonii (sic) Levite super Regnorum". The commentary is written in single columns apart from the capitula to Bk III.

- f. 147r Title followed by "Regum successiones post iudices..."

164v capitula for Bk II

175v capitula for Bk III

180r "... in timore Dei. Factum est igitur..."

i.e. long text of the de Templo

194r "...prius completa." f. 194 now consists of a thin strip of parchment across the width of the book containing three lines of text. The reverse side is blank. I suggest that the scribe, on finding that his exemplar was not complete, left one or more folii to be filled when he could obtain a second copy. Since the space was never filled, the blank parchment was trimmed off at a later date.

I have been able to check the text of the manuscript with that of the first two and last two folii of V, and have also obtained supplementary information about the capitula of V from the Nationalbibliothek of Vienna. Since all the information obtained shows that the two manuscripts agree in all particulars I believe that Z is a copy made from V.

S Mons, Bibliothèque Publique 2/225 of the twelfth century

This manuscript was purchased for the Abbaye de Bonne Espérance near Mons in the twelfth century. It contains works by Bede and one of the Pseudo-Clementine letters in addition to Claudius' commentary on Ruth. It is written in single columns on pages 220 x 130 mm.

f. 107r "incipit expositio Claudii Episcopi in libro Ruth. Factum est..."

112r "... in saecula saeculorum Amen.

Explicit expositio Claudii episcopi in libro Ruth".

Information about this manuscript is taken from Faider, P. & Mme Faider-Feytmans, Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique de la ville de Mons, 3-4 and from a photocopy of the Ruth commentary supplied by the Library.

G Vienna, Oesterreichs Nationalbibliothek 691

of the second half of the twelfth century

This comes from the Benedictine monastery of Goettweig and not from Heiligenkreuz as stated by P. Bellet and others. It contains Anselm's Cur Deus Homo as well as the commentaries on Genesis and on Samuel and Kings written by Claudius. They have been attributed to Eucherius by a hand of the end of the twelfth century. The scribe of the manuscript is called Wiligarius.

f. 127a "Incipiunt capitula subsequentis libri..."

127b "Regum tempora post iudices..."

145v capitula for Bk II

157r capitula for Bk III

161r "... in timore Dei. Factum est igitur..." i.e.

long text of the de Templo

(I regret that owing to an oversight I was not supplied with details of the capitula to Bk IV).

A description of the manuscript is given in H.J. Hermann, Die deutschen romanischen Handschriften, 205 in the series ed. F. Wickhoff, Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Oesterreich, VIII, 3. I am grateful to the staff of the Nationalbibliothek for the further information provided by them.

It is usually stated that this manuscript was used by J.A. Kohlbürger for his edition of the commentaries on Genesis and on Samuel and Kings published in 1531. Comparison of a photographic copy of the first five pages of the manuscript with the printed edition of Samuel and Kings in MPL L reveals many small differences. While the evidence cannot be taken as conclusive without a more comprehensive study, I believe that this manuscript was not the source of the printed edition.

N Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Latin 17380 (Collection Navarre) of the fourteenth century

According to information kindly supplied by the Bibliothèque Nationale this appears to have been copied in the South of France. It once belonged to the Collège de Navarre at Paris. The manuscript is written in two columns on large pages of fine white vellum, with many illuminated initials and border decorations.

- f. 70a "Incipiunt capitula in libro primo. de Elchana....."
- 70b "Incipit prefatio claudii episcopi taurinensis: ..." Claudius' letter
- 70d "Incipit expositio claudii claudii (sic) episcopi in libro ruth. Et factum est...."
- 72a "Incipit liber informationum litterae et spiritus in libro Regum. Regum tempora post iudices...."

85v-86r capitula for Bk II

94v-95r capitula for Bk III

98r "... in timore Dei. Factum est igitur ..."
i.e. long text of de Templo

120v-121r capitula for Bk IV

141c second letter by Claudius

141d the appendix to the commentary

147d "...constat nisi servitute deposita."
i.e. the ending as printed in Migne.

This de luxe manuscript, although the latest in date, is the only one to have conserved the original title. It is one of the best witnesses to the original text of Claudius' commentary.

H The catalogues of Heiligenkreuz library for 1363-74 and 1381 list a manuscript of the commentaries on Genesis and on Samuel and Kings by Eucherius. This is the manuscript used by J.A. Kohlbürger for the edition of 1531 described below. (see T. Gottlieb, : Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Oesterreichs, I, 25,29; 60,9-10)

Summary of the contents of the manuscripts

Sigla	Intro. Letters	Author- ship	Commen- tary on Ruth	Capit- ula to Bk I	Long Text of Bk III	Appendix to Bk IV
<u>V</u>	No	(Eucherius)	No	No	Yes	text ends in Bk III
<u>Z</u>	No	Angelonius (sic)	No	No	Yes	as above
<u>P</u>	Yes	Claudius	No	Yes	No	Yes
<u>M</u>	Yes	Claudius	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<u>G</u>	No	Eucherius	No	Yes	Yes	No
<u>H</u>	No	Eucherius	No	?	Yes	No
<u>N</u>	Claudius' letter only	Claudius	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<u>S</u>	No	Claudius	Yes	No	No	No

The relation between the manuscripts is as follows. The Ms N was copied from a good exemplar and the Ms S is related to it. Both P and M (the Italian Mss) are descended from a common ancestor which contained the commentary on Ruth and the short text of the de Templo. The Austrian group consists of Z which is a copy of V, G, and the lost manuscript of Heiligenkreuz, H. G and H are more closely related to each other than to V.



2. Printed Editions

The earliest edition of Claudius' commentary dates from 1531 when J.A. Kohlburger (Brassicanus) published the commentaries on Genesis and on Samuel and Kings, attributing them to Eucherius of Lyons on the strength of a note in the manuscript. This is (according to Bellet) the manuscript 691 in the Vienna Nationalbibliothek. Kohlburger's edition is to be found in Migne's Patrologia Latina in volume L, 1047-1208.

The introductory letters were published for the first time by A. Zaccharia in his Bibliotheca Pistoriensis of 1752 (pp. 60-4) from ms. P. In 1755 Johannes Chrysostomus Trombelli published his Veterum Patrum Latinorum opuscula nunquam adhuc edita at Bologna. That contained a number of works including the whole of the commentary on Samuel and Kings as given in the Pistoia manuscript. The collations used by Trombelli contained a number of careless errors. For example in the list of the Bible references in Bede's XXX Quaestiones (see MPL CIV, 625-6) the four references numbered 6-9 in the printed edition come as numbers 15-8 in the manuscript. Since these refer to Solomon and later events, and interrupt a sequence of verses about David, I can think of no good reason for the change. Also the biblical order is that followed by Bede himself.

However Trombelli was on the whole a careful and learned editor. He had noticed that there were extracts from the works of Augustine, Gregory the Great and others, which he identified by means of markings and footnotes in his edition

(ibid., 621-2). He tells us that he compared the editions of the Fathers with the work in front of him and emended Claudius' commentary in many places. It is good to be able to report that most of the emendations I have observed are those of spelling, punctuation, and obvious scribal errors. The printed edition is a reliable guide to the text of the manuscript, and it has not been edited to conform with the best editions of the sources available in the eighteenth century.

Trombelli had noted that some parts of the commentary by Claudius were the same as parts of the commentary on Samuel and Kings by Hrabanus. He made the assumption that both authors had drawn on a common source or sources, and one of my tasks has been to identify most of these passages which were taken from works by Jerome and Caesarius of Arles. He also observed that the commentary was almost identical with that published under the name of Eucherius. In defence of the publication of the commentary under the name of Claudius he said first that there were some differences, and secondly that he believed that the work attributed to Eucherius ought to be considered as that of Claudius (ibid., 622). This short passage at the end of the introduction to Trombelli's edition seems to have escaped the notice of writers on Claudius and his works. Trombelli's edition is to be found in vol. CIV of Migne (623-834).

For the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, E. Duemmler prepared an edition of the introductory letters from the manuscripts at Pistoia and Mantua (MGH EpKA II, 605-8).

3. Modern works about the commentary

Studies of Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings have been concerned with two subjects, the sources used by Claudius and the relationship between his commentary and commentaries by later writers such as Hrabanus Maurus.

J.C. Trombelli was the first to study these two questions.³ In his work on sources he went far beyond the work done by the editors of Hrabanus, Alcuin and other Carolingian writers. He discovered nearly all the sources and gave references by author, work and chapter. In discussion of the relationship between the commentary and the commentary on Samuel and Kings by Hrabanus he suggested that both drew upon common sources.

At the beginning of this century two writers addressed themselves to the problem of whether Claudius should be regarded as a source for the commentaries of Hrabanus. A.E. Schoenbach⁴ dealt with the commentaries on Samuel and Kings very briefly in a discussion focussed on the commentaries on Matthew by the two Carolingian exegetes. His conclusion was that, as far as his study on Matthew was concerned, there was a certain degree of dependence by Hrabanus on Claudius.

There is a more complete, although less well known study of the same question in two articles by J.B. Hablitzel.⁵

3. MPL CIV, 621-2.

4. "Ueber einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters" in Sitzungsberichte Kais. Akad. Wissenschaften Wien (Phil-Hist classe) CXLVI (1903), Abh. IV, 90-107.

5. "Hrabanus Maurus und Claudius von Turin" in Historisches Jahrbuch XXVII (1906) 74-85 and XXXVIII (1917) 538-552.

When discussing the commentaries on Matthew he concluded that Hrabanus did not copy Claudius' commentary, but that he did know it and made use of it in the preparation of his own. In his first article he had examined the sources for the commentaries on Samuel and Kings by Claudius and Hrabanus, listing all those in Claudius' commentary that he could trace. He checked the sources traced by Trombelli and added to that list passages from Origen's Homily on I Samuel and Jerome's commentary on Isaiah.

In a careful consideration of the contents of the two commentaries he discussed the similarities between them, which he traced to the use of common sources, and the differences, both in the choice and use of sources and also in passages written by the authors themselves. From these he was able to show that the two commentaries arose independently of each other.

He suggested that Claudius returned to the original sources where this was possible, rather than accept the intermediate sources used by Hrabanus. In the story of the Witch of Endor, Isidore,⁶ quoted a passage from Augustine's ad Simplicianum which he shortened considerably. Hrabanus followed Isidore. Claudius copied the introduction from Isidore, but took the text directly from Augustine's ad Simplicianum quoting it in toto.⁷

6. MPL LXXXIII, 407-10.

7. MPL CIV, 685-6; MPL XL, 142-3.

Hablitzel also stated that Claudius drew quotations from the works of Gregory, not from the Liber Testimoniorum of Paterius but directly from the Moralia and other compositions. In view of the deficiencies of the printed text of Paterius this contention is difficult to establish. A more recent study of that question by R. Wasselynck⁸ comes to the conclusion that the source for Claudius' quotations from the Moralia was Paterius.

The only student who has concentrated his attention on the works of Claudius of Turin is P. Bellet. In his first article⁹ he established that the commentaries on Genesis and on Samuel and Kings published under the name of Eucherius of Lyons¹⁰ were by Claudius of Turin. He said that the evidence for Samuel and Kings is obvious as soon as one compares the two printed editions. In his opinion the Eucherian version was the commentary written by Claudius with the omission of the introductory letters and the appendix and with the addition of Bede's de Templo copied from a manuscript belonging to Claudius. My discussion of the relation between Bede's de Templo and Claudius' commentary is contained in Appendix Three.

8. "L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux (VIIe-XIIe S.)" in Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale XXXII (1965), 157-204, see p. 172.

9. "Claudio de Turin, autor de los comentarios "in genesim et regum" del Pseudo Eucherio" in Estudios Bíblicos IX (1950), 209-23.

10. MPL L, 893-1208.

Bellet returned briefly to discuss the commentary on Samuel and Kings in a later article.¹¹ The de Imaginibus which Bellet wishes to attribute to Claudius contains a short passage from Bede's de Templo (in praise of images) which was omitted from the Pseudo-Eucherian version of Claudius' commentary. Bellet was forced to conclude therefore that the omission was not caused by Claudius' objections to the opinions expressed by Bede, as he had earlier supposed.

M.L.W. Laistner wrote an article, "Some Early Medieval Commentaries on the Old Testament",¹² in which he made a few remarks about Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings. A note at the end of the article summarised Bellet's article in Estudios Bíblicos.

Capitula

Since modern works are provided with chapter divisions, footnotes, indexes and other aids to the reader, it is difficult to imagine the difficulties under which a scholar of the Middle Ages worked. One of the devices which was used during the medieval period to help the reader was a system of capitula, i.e. chapter headings gathered together in a list at the beginning of a book, with, in some cases, markings in the margin of the manuscript to show the beginning of each section.

-
11. "Il 'Liber de imaginibus sanctorum' bajo el nombre de Agobardo de Lyon, obra de Claudio de Turín" in Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia XXVI (1953), 151-94.
 12. in Harvard Theol. Review XLVI (1953), 27-46 reprinted in Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages, 181-201.

This is so obviously useful an invention and so universally applied that I was surprised to find a lack of information about capitula when I wished to find out when the system was first applied regularly to works of literature. The manuscript evidence shows that the capitula to Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings were provided by the author or by someone very close to him in date (they are identical in all the manuscripts). Since the capitula which are given in Hurst's edition of the de Templo of Bede¹³ are also found in Claudius' commentary where the text of the commentary required them, it may be presumed that Bede's de Templo had acquired capitula by the beginning of the ninth century at the latest. The surviving manuscripts of the de Templo, which all contain capitula, date from the ninth century or later.

The only work from the classical age of Latin literature in which I have found lists of chapter divisions is Pliny's Natural Histories. Book one consists of lists of subjects and sources for each of the succeeding books.¹⁴ An index of that kind is obviously useful in an encyclopaedic work.

A brief examination of the volumes of C.L.A. and of modern editions of the Fathers revealed that authors up to the age of Gregory the Great did not divide their works by means of a system of capitula. Capitula are to be found in some of the manuscripts of the Fathers' works dating from the eighth century or later. It would therefore seem that capitula were provided for patristic works in the seventh or eighth centuries.

13. C.C. CXIX A, 146.

14. Cf. Natural History I, ed. H. Rackham (London, 1949), 24-167.

The only study of a system of capitula that I have seen is by A. Souter.¹⁵ He said that it was fairly clear from an examination of the manuscripts of Jerome's commentary on St Matthew's Gospel that Jerome did not himself apply a system of capitula to that work. Souter found two systems of capitula in one manuscript and one of these systems in some others. What makes this information of particular interest is that the systems used are based on the capitula and on the Eusebian Canons found in manuscripts of the Vulgate text of St Matthew's Gospel.

The origins of a system of capitula must be found either in Pliny's Natural Histories or, more probably, in the prefatory material found in manuscripts of the books of the Bible. Since the Bible was read far more than any other book, by the fourth century Christian scholars had devised several systems in order to find the right place quickly. The earliest known system of chapter divisions is found in Codex Alexandrinus written in the first half of the fifth century. However my interest lay in discovering when these systems were applied to other books.

An initial search for information suggested that one of the earliest Latin works to incorporate capitula as a part of the author's original plan was Adamnan's de Locis Sanctis. I approached the author of the modern edition¹⁶ of that work, Professor L. Bieler, summarising what I had discovered and asking if he could suggest fresh avenues of approach. He

15. "Traces of an unknown system of capitula for St Matthew's Gospel" in J.T.S. XXXIII (1932), 188-189.

16. C.C. CLXXV, 183-234.

very generously wrote:

I am sure that capitula originated in the breves causae prefixed to the books of the Bible. The earliest MSS known to us do not have any, but they are found e.g. in the sixth century Gospels Cambridge C.C.C. 286.

As to Patristic works, I am not sure. It seems to me that there is no evidence of their presence in MSS of the fourth to seventh century. In the Augustine Verona XXVIII (26), saec V in., they were added in the time of Pacificus. On the other hand, the capitula in Adamnan's Vita s. Columbae (Schaffhausen) and de locis sanctis seem to be original. In the Life of St. Patrick by Muirchú the capitula in A (Book of Armagh) are certainly not an addition by the scribe, Ferdomnach (d. 846), but were copied from his exemplar. I think I have evidence to show that they were not included by the author either, but by someone very near him in time (and place), reflecting as they do, a change of plan by the author(?), which is carried out in the Brussels and Vienna texts.

It seems then quite plausible to assume that the practice originated in the Irish-Northumbrian schools. With regard to Bede, again, it is hard to say whether he had capitula. The c- recension of the Ecclesiastical History, to which the Moore Bede belongs, has them...

I have since noted that several of the works in Arévalo's edition of Isidore contain lists of subjects, e.g. [in] the de Ortu et Obitu Patrum¹⁷ and Regula Monachorum,¹⁸ which appear to be part of the author's plan. Professor Bieler has also drawn my attention to the edition of the Etymologiae by W.M. Lindsay,¹⁹ where capitula are listed. Although Lindsay has placed the capitula at the beginning of his edition, he states that they are found in the manuscripts at the beginning of each book.

17. MPL LXXXIII, 129-156.

18. ibid., 867-894.

19. Isidore, Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), vol I, pp. B2f.

Since information about which manuscripts contain capitula is hard to come by and since many modern editions do not mention capitula, an attempt to write a history of capitula must await the gathering of more material. However I have come to some tentative conclusions.

I suggest that Isidore, finding the usefulness of a system of capitula, applied it to all his works which supplied information in a systematic way, and possibly to other works including those of biblical exegesis. I do not think that near contemporaries such as Gregory the Great and Paterius used capitula.

What is more certain is that Irish-Northumbrian writers, among whom are Adamnan and Bede, used capitula in their longer works frequently, but perhaps not invariably. It is here also that, I think, we ought to look for the scribes who applied capitula retrospectively to patristic writings. By the time of the Carolingian renaissance capitula were regarded as part of the regular stock in trade of a scholar and were to be found in most manuscripts copied and in most works composed at that period.

Chapter Five

This chapter consists of the tables of information that I have collected about the sources of Claudius' commentary.

The first editor J.C. Trombelli recognised that the commentary was a catena and set himself the task of identifying as many of the sources as he could. By means of diacritical markings he distinguished the beginning and end of most of the extracts used by Claudius and in footnotes gave references to the authors, works and chapters from which the extracts were taken. Trombelli's edition was, for its time, careful and useful. It is hardly surprising that he did not discover all the sources. The number that he did find included such rareties as the homily attributed to Chrysostom.

My task has been to check the references given by Trombelli, correcting a few minor errors and providing references to modern editions where these exist. I have also tried to fill some of the gaps left by Trombelli. The results are gratifying. Origen (in translation), Jerome, Caesarius of Arles, "Eusebius Gallicanus" and Bede have all provided the sources of passages Trombelli could not find. Since I discovered these sources an article by J.B. Hablitzel has reached me in which he identifies some of the same sources.

There are still some passages that defy identification, notably a sermon on David and Nathan, another on Elijah and Ahab, some short passages on Solomon and some on Elisha.

The first of these has been attributed by Trombelli to Augustine on the grounds of style. A diligent search through works on the books of Samuel, and on Psalm LI has failed to find the patristic source of that.

There are shorter passages that also cannot be traced to a source. These are of two kinds. Some are literal expositions, giving geographical or other information, often quoting from other parts of the Bible. Others are allegorical, explaining the significance of some person or event. In both cases I think that most of the passages can be attributed to the pen of Claudius. Several of them appear to have been composed to answer questions asked by the dedicatee of the commentary, the abbot Theutmir.

Three lists follow this introductory section. The first lists all the sources I have been able to trace, giving references to the editions used. The second list gives the incipits and explicits of every passage in the commentary, with references to the sources where these have been traced. The third list repeats the incipits and explicits of all the passages not yet identified.

The Sources

Works used by Claudius in the preparation of the Commentary on I-IV Kings with a list of the editions used in checking the extracts are given below.

St. Augustine: Contra Faustum C.S.E.L. XXV (1) 251-797

(Vienna 1891)

de Civitate Dei C.C. XLVII-XLVIII

(Turnholt 1955)

de Correptione et Gratia MPL XLIV, 915-946

de cura pro mortuis gerenda C.S.E.L. XLI,

621-660 (Vienna 1891)

de diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum

MPL XL, 101-148

de Genesi ad litteram C.S.E.L. XXVIII (3,1)

3-455 (Vienna 1894)

de Trinitate MPL XLII, 819-1098.

Enarrationes in Psalmos (in Ps. XVII) C.C.

XXXVIII-LX (Turnholt, 1956)

Bede: Aliquot Quaestionem liber MPL XCIII,

455-478

de Tabernaculo et Vasis eius ac Vestibus

Sacerdotum C.C. CXIX A. 3-139

(Turnholt 1969)

de Templo C.C. CXIX A. 143-234 (Turnholt 1969)

de Temporum Ratione MGH A.A. XIII, 247-327

in Marcum C.C. CXX, 437-648 (Turnholt 1960)

in Regum librum XXX Quaestiones, C.C.

CXIX 293-322 (Turnholt 1962)

Nomina locorum C.C. CXIX, 273-287.

St. Caesarius
of Arles:

Sermones nos. cxxix, cxxx C.C. CIII,

531-36 (Turnholt 1953)

"Eusebius
Gallicanus":

Homilia XLVII C.C. C A 555-63

St. Gregory
the Great:

Moralia in Job MPL LXXV 515 - LXXVI, 782.

Homiliae in Ezechiel MPL LXXVI, 785-1072

St. Isidore:

Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu
quaestiones in vetus Testamentum

MPL LXXIII, 207-424

St. Jerome:

Commentarius in Ecclesiasten C.C. LXXII

250-361 (Turnholt, 1959) (or Alcuin,

Commentarius in Ecclesiasten MPL C.

668f

Commentariorum in Esaiam libri XVIII C.C.

LXXIII-LXXIII A (Turnholt, 1963)

Onomasticon MPL XXIII 905-982

John Chrysostom
(attributed):

in Sanctis Petrum et Heliam ; ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΙΣ

ΠΕΤΡΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΑΝ ΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ

MPG L, 725-36

Origen: Homilia in Librum Regnorum I G.C.S.
Origines VIII 8-9 (Leipzig, 1925) Je

Paterius: Liber testimoniorum veteris Testamenti
MPL LXXIX 683-916

The Sources

1. 636d-
2. 637b-c "Fuit vir unus"
Cf. (Bede XXX Quest. I,1; C.C. CXIX, 296 and Isidore Appendix ad libros Regum; MPL LXXXIII, 425-6)
- 2a. 637c-638d "Et habuit uxores duas" ... "qui deo vacat et verbo Dei" Origen in Librum Regnorum Homilia I C.C.S. Origen VIII, 8-9
3. 639a-45b. "Ita ne vero" ... "peperit septem" Aug. de Civit. XVII, 4; C.C. XLVIII, 556-562.
4. 645b "Hoc canticum iuxta septuaginta" ... "continet historiam" note by Claudius on Old Latin text used by Aug. to which he prefers another version, the Vulgate.
5. 645b-c "Interea Samuel" .. "reputatur" Isidore Quest. I Reg. I, 7-9; MPL LXXXIII, 393
6. 645c-647c. "Sed hoc evidentius" .. "animam meam faciat" Aug. de Civit. XVII, 5 (the Bible text revised to agree with the Vulgate); op.cit., 562-564.
7. 647c-648b. "Sub figura Samuelis" .. "facio semper" Bede, XXX Quest. I. the first third only; op.cit., 296.
8. 648b-648c. "In hoc vero" .. "vocabulis ista dici" Aug. de Civit. XVII, 5; op.cit., 564.
9. 648c-649a. "Et aedificabo" .. "ista mortalitas" Aug. de Civit. XVII, 5; op.cit., 564. N.B. 'transibit' in Aug. has been changed to 'ambulabit' (vg. I Reg. II, 35)
10. 649a- "Alioquin quo modo" .. "Domino soli" Bede XXX Quest. I. op.cit., 296-7.
11. 649a-c "Quod vero adiungitur - (secutus) adiunxit" Aug. de Civit. XVII, 5; op.cit., 564-565.
12. 649c-650a. "Et offerat nummum" .. "ordinem Melchisedech" Isidore Quest. I. Reg. II. 7-9; op.cit., 394-5.
13. 650a-b. "Factum est" .. "lumen amisit"
14. 650b-c. "Crevit autem" .. "eorum ageret" Bede XXX Quest. II; op.cit., 297-8.

15. 650c-651d. "Igitur postquam" .. "Verbum Dei".
Isidore Quest. 1. Reg. III 1-7; op.cit., 395-6.
16. 651d-652c. "Cum vero" .. "si inflectitur, remissa".
Paterius in 1 Reg. III. MPL LXXIX 791
17. 652c-653a. "Percussit autem" .. "ad Dominum"
Bede XXX Quest. III; op.cit., 298. Includes the
Greek word "laos". (Claud. omits a ref. to
"tuus codex")
18. 653a. "Isti ab hoc percussi" .. "mulctati sunt"
a discussion of the word "despexerunt" for "viderunt"
which the author found in another mss. (alia
translatio)
19. 653a-654a. "Et factum est" .. "complicem".
Bede XXX Quest. IV. op.cit., 298-9.
20. 654b. "Cariathiarim" .. "sicut Hieremias scribit"
21. 654b-655b. "Samuel autem" .. "congregentur"
Isidore Quest. I. Reg. IV; op.cit., 396-7.
22. 655b. "Iudicavit autem" .. "Saul regem"
Isidore Quest. I. Reg. V. 1-2; op.cit., 397.
23. 655c-657c. "Et hoc quidem" .. "postea premebatur"
Aug. ad Simplic. II. 1. 1-2 with short omissions.
MPL XL 129-131.
24. 657c-d. "Ungitur post hoc" .. "regnaturo"
Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. V. 2-3; op.cit., 397.
25. 657d-658d. "Filius unius anni erat Saul" .. "vocantur,
et questus"
26. 658d-659b. "Ita Chaldaei" .. "prorsus erubescant"
Bede XXX Quest. XXX, short extracts. op.cit., 320-1.
27. 659c. "Saul autem" .. "liberatum"
Isidore Quest. I. Reg. VI; op.cit., 397.
28. 659c. "Iniit autem Saul" .. "ex Aegypti confinio"
Cf. Bede "Nomina locorum" C.C. CXIX, 278 but with
differences. Claud. disagrees with Bede's
interpretation.
29. 659d-660a. "Percusso hoc termino" .. "Omnis
praescientia" A linking passage to introduce the
extract from ad Simplic.

30. 660a-663c. "Nos vero cum" .. "valuimus, disputavimus"
Aug. ad Simplic. II. 2; op.cit., 138-142.
31. 663c-664a. "Veniens autem Samuel" .. "se esse meliorem"
Paterius, in I. Reg. IV op.cit., 791-2.
32. 664a-d. "Obedientia victimis" .. "egressionis claudit"
Paterius in I Reg. VIII, first part only op.cit.,
793-4.
33. 664d-666c. "Conversus est autem Samuel" .. "spiritualem
felicitem" Aug. de Civit. XVII. 7 op.cit., 567-9
with a note at the beginning that the text is
iuxta Septuaginta.
34. 666c. "Sumpsit ergo Samuel gladium" .. "interimere
voluerat"
35. 666d-670b. "Igitur recedente" .. "tunc diceretur"
Aug. ad Simplic. III. 1. 4-6 op.cit., 131-134.
36. 670b-d. "Itaque Saul" .. "bonum provocemus"
Isidore Quest. I. Reg. IX. op.cit., 398-9.
37. 670d-671a. "Plerumque etiam" .. "tranquillitate
revocetur" Paterius, in I. Reg. X. op.cit., 795.
38. 671a-672a. "Post haec David" .. "caput incidit"
Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. X. op.cit., 399-400.
39. 672a-c. "Convenit etiam" .. "gladio detruncamus"
Paterius, in I. Reg. XI. op.cit., 795-6.
40. 672c-674a. "Interea victoria David" .. "et prophetabat"
Isidore Quest. I. Reg. XI-XII. op.cit., 400-402.
41. 674a-677a. "Non enim potest" .. "atque mutato"
Aug. ad Simplic. II. 1, 7-11. op.cit., 134-138.
42. 677a-678a. "Ait namque Jonathas" .. "plenus accepit"
Bede XXX Quest. V. op.cit., 299-300.
43. 678a-b. "Surrexit itaque David" .. "et vos
persequentur" Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. XV, 1-3
op.cit., 403.
44. 678b-c. "Quod vero Dominus" .. "sacerdotis faceret"
Bede Commentarius in Marcum, I. 2, 25-6. C.C.
CXX. 464.
45. 678c-679a. "In Doeck" .. "sic occisurus" part from
Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. XV, 4. op.cit., 403.

46. 679a-680d. "Interea David" .. "est amputatio"
Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. XVI-XVII, 7. op.cit., 403-5.
47. 680d-681b. "In eo autem" .. "veneratio exhibebatur"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 6. op.cit., 566-7.
48. 681b-681d. "Moraliter vero" .. "contra Dominum"
Paterius in I. Reg. XII. op.cit., 796.
49. 682a-682d. "Tunc David accinctus" .. "rebus auferendi"
Bede, XXX Quest. VI. op.cit., 300-1.
50. 682d-683a. "Et in hoc facto" .. "non audivit"
Paterius in I. Reg. XIII. op.cit., 796-7.
51. 683a-683c. "Idem David fugiens" .. "funditus
extinguit" Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. XIV, 1-2
op.cit., 406.
52. 683c-684c. "Quid est quod" .. "Non valebant"
Paterius in I. Reg. XIV (first half), XV.
op.cit., 797-8.
53. 684c-687c. "Post mortem autem" .. "non datur"
Isidore, Quest. I. Reg. XX op.cit., 407-10 but
containing the full text of Aug. ad Simplic. II,
3. op.cit., 142-143.
54. 687c-688b. "Et praecepit" .. "doctissimo, salutem"
Bede, XXX Quest. VII. op.cit., 301-2.
55. 688b-689a. "Montes Gelboe" .. "comburendos relinquant"
Bede, aliquot Quaestionum liber. VI in MPL
XCIII, 458.
56. 689a-689b. "De quibus" .. "meruissent"
Paterius, in II. Reg. I. op.cit., 797-8.
57. 689b-690b. "Nec tibi absurdum" .. "pertinebit"

Book II

1. 689d-692c. "Promissiones Dei" .. "ad utramque"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 1-3 (with a short omission
from 2) op.cit., 550-553.
2. 692c-692d. "Post mortem Saul" .. "dum sentiunt"
Aug. de cura mort. IX. C.S.E.L. XLI, 639.

3. 693a-693c. "Cuius Asael typum" .. "ferro moriuntur"
Paterius in II Reg. II. op.cit., 798-9.
4. 693c-694a. "Ostiararia triticum" .. "neglectae
cogitationis" Paterius in II Reg. III, op.cit., 799.
5. 694a-694c. "Congregavit autem David" .. "conservandum
mandetur" Bede aliquot Quaestionum liber, VIII.
op.cit., 460.
6. 694d-697a. "Erat quidem prius arca" .. "mortis expectant"
".. humilitate servabat". Bede aliquot Questionum
liber, VIII. op.cit., 459-462.
7. 697a-698b. "Quem enim" .. "in oculis meis"
Paterius in II Reg. V. op.cit., 800-1.
8. 698b-699a. "Sacerdos quoque" .. "infirmi iudicarent"
Paterius in II Reg. IV. op.cit., 799-800.
9. 699a-699b. "Post haec" .. "mihi in filium"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 8. op.cit., 570.
10. 699b-700c. "Hanc tam grandem" .. "semen tuum"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 8-9. op.cit., 571-2.
11. 700d. "Qui si inique" .. "populus eius est"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 9. op.cit., 573.
12. 701a-701c. "Illud vero" .. "ducenda est"
Aug. de Civit. XVII, 12 (end), 13. op.cit., 577-8.
13. 701c-702b. "Quid aliud" .. "tempus invenerit"
Aug. ad Simplic. II, 4. op.cit., 144-5.
14. 702b-c. "Fecit quoque David" .. "saporis extinguit".
Paterius in II Reg. VII op.cit., 801.
15. 702c-703a. "Sicut enim Hanon Rex Moab" .. "stare
valeant".
16. 703a-704c. "Plerumque quaedam" .. "gerenda persuadeat".
Paterius in II Reg. VIII op.cit., 801-2.
17. 704c-706a. "Ad hoc enim" .. "voluntatis suae".
Paterius in II Reg. IX. op.cit., 803-4.
18. 706b-c. "Si peccatum" .. "vult vindicari".
Paterius in II Reg. XI. op.cit., 804.
19. 706c-707d. "Quod vero dicit" .. "emendatione sanari".
20. 707d-708c. "Quisquis fidelium" .. "posse confiditur".
Paterius in II Reg. XII. op.cit., 803-4.

21. 708c-709a. "Illud vero" .. "non habuit".
Isidore, Quest. II Reg. III op.cit., 412-3.
22. 709a-b. "Sed fortasse" .. "nulla datur".
Isidore, Quest. II Reg. II, 8-9 op.cit., 412.
23. 709b-710a. "Percusso Absalom" .. "ex malitia percutit".
Paterius, in II Reg. XIII op.cit., 805.
24. 710a-b. "Sequitur psalmus" .. "regnum Dei".
Isidore, Quest. II Reg. V. op.cit., 414.
25. 710b-718c. Aug. Enarr. in Ps. XVII, with insertions
from Paterius super Psalmos nos. 38, op.cit., 828,
at 711d; 39, op.cit., 829, at 712a-b; 40, op.cit.,
829, at 712c-d; 41, op.cit., 829, at 713a; 42,
op.cit., 829-30, at 715c-716a.
26. 718c-d. "Haec nomina" .. "hostibus exhibebat".
Bede XXX Quest. IX, op.cit., 303.
27. 718d. "Absurdum non est" .. "non pervenerunt".
three lines of introductory matter.
28. 718d-719b. "Item ipse David" .. "aliena deleret".
Isidore, Quest. II Reg. IV, op.cit., 413-4.
29. 719b-d. "In hoc facto" .. "a licitis abstinebat".
Paterius in II Reg. XIV, op.cit., 805.
30. 720a. "Ad hanc aquam" .. "interfecit leonem".
Bede XXX Quest. X, op.cit., 303.
31. 720b. "Dehinc texitur" .. "quoslibet protegunt".
Cf. Isidore Quest II. Reg. VI, op.cit., 414.
32. 720b-722b. "Peccat post haec David" .. "non recedat".
Paterius in II Reg. XV, op.cit., 806.

Book III

1. 721d-723a. "Senuit David" .. "Salomon quippe" .. "quod
estis vos". Isidore, Quest. III Reg. I, op.cit.,
413-4.
2. 723a-b. "Tribus nominibus" .. "conscripti sunt".
Jerome, Ecclesiastes I.1. C.C. ed. LXXII p.250
also Alcuin, Ecclesiastes I.1. (MPL C. 668).
3. 723b-724b. "Ubi notandum quod" .. "substantiam
reformemur". Paterius in III Reg. I, op.cit., 806-7.

4. 724b-c. "In isto iudicio" .. "illiciendi persuadent".
Isidore Quest. III Reg. I, op.cit., 416-7.
5. 724c-725c. "Moraliter vero; in hac" .. "gaudia sequuntur". Paterius in III Reg. II, Op.cit., 807-8.
6. 725c-726a. "Locutus est" .. "fidem deduxit".
Isidore Quest. III Reg. III, op.cit., 416.
7. 726a-733c. "Sequitur dehinc historia; quando Salomon"
.. "timore Dei". Bede de Templo C.C. CXIX, 148-157.
8. 733c. "Aedificium in superiore huius voluminis parte habes a beato Beda expositum". Note in Mss P and M.
9. "Factum est igitur quadringentesimo" .. "pusillos cum maioribus". The long text of the de Templo is found in Mss V, Z, G and N and in MPL L 1110a-1157c C.C. CXIX, 157-234.
10. 733c-734c. "Venerunt cuncti senes" .. "gaudia vident".
Bede, XXX Quest. XIV, op.cit., 306-7, omitting ten lines.
11. 734c-735b. "Deinde sequitur" .. "Tabernaculo reservandum".
12. 735b-c. "Erat autem in arca" .. "intelligendum reliquit". Bede, XXX Quest. XIV, op.cit., 306-7, the ten lines omitted previously.
13. 735c-d. "Factum est" .. "cultum credulitatis".
Isidore, Quest. III Reg. II, 5-6, op.cit., 415.
14. 736a-736c. "Post perfectum" .. "perciperet veritatis".
15. 736c-738c. "Haec est illa regina" .. "de satietate fastidium". "Eusebius Gallicanus" Homilia XLVII in C.C. CI A, 556-563.
16. 738c-739a. "Fecit etiam rex Salomon thronum" ..
"tribus israel".
17. 739a-b. "Post aliquanta" .. "in civitate Jerusalem".
18. 739b-c. "Rex autem Salomon amavit" .. "desertum esse cognovit".
19. 739c-740a. "Iam vero de caeteris" .. "malos in zizania".
Isidore, Quest. III Reg. VI, op.cit., 417-8.
20. 740b. "Illud vero" .. "salvae factae sunt".
Isidore Quest. III Reg. VII, op.cit., 418.

21. 740b-c. "Quod vero unitas pallii" .. "subditam detinent".
 22. 740c-742a. "Post multa alia" .. "industria restaurati". Bede, XXX Quest. VII, op.cit., 301-2.
-

Book IV

1. 741c-742c. "Post divisionem" .. "quam ipsi suas". Aug. de Correptione et Gratia XIV (MPL XLIV, 913).
2. 742c-43b. "Quid est homo" .. "negligenter culpam admisisset". Paterius, in III Reg. VII (op.cit., 809-10).
3. 743c-744d. "Quanti haec poena" .. "qui creavit". Aug. de cura gerenda pro mortuis VII, VIII (C.S.E.L. XLI, 634-7).
4. 744d-745a. "Praetermissa multa" .. "aliquid disseramus". a short summary of the following section of the commentary.
5. 745a-746b. "Lucus locus est silvester spissus" .. "inquit Isaias, usque ad pedes".
6. 746b-747a. "In diebus autem" .. "propter nos". Bede XXX Quest. XVI (op.cit., 309-10).
7. 747a-b. "Sciendum est quod" .. "conspectu sto". Paterius in III Reg. VIII (op.cit., 810).
8. 747b-748c. "Helias iam" .. "expletas noscuntur". Pseudo Chrysostom in ss. Petrum et Heliam, 2 (MPG L, 728-9).
9. 748c-d. "Pascitur deinde" .. "ressurrectionem, percipientes". Aug. Contra Faustum XII, 34 (C.S.E.L. XXV, 6, 1 p. 361).
10. 748d. "potest et per panem" .. "praedicatione leguntur".
11. 749a-c. "Postquam vero exsiccatus" .. "substantiam procuraret".
12. 749c-750a. "At Helias videns mulierem" .. "filio tuo facies postea". Pseudo Chrysostom in ss. Petrum et Heliam 3 (op.cit., 731).

13. 750a-754c. "O magnificum mulieris" .. "supplicat
dicens". Pseudo Chrysostom in ss. Petrum et Heliam
3 (op.cit., 731-2).
14. 754c-755b. "O Domine testis" .. "faciebat obscuram".
Aug. ad Simplic. II, 5 (op.cit., 145-6).
15. 755b-759a. "Factum est verbum" .. "fuisset permissum".
Pseudo Chrysostom, in ss. Petrum et Heliam 4
(op.cit., 733-4).
16. 759b-760a. "Sancti viri" .. "in infirmitatibus
servabatur". Paterius in III Reg. IX (op.cit., 810).
17. 760a-763c. "proiecitque se" .. "scientiam Dei".
Pseudo Chrysostom, in ss. Petrum et Heliam 4, but
it differs considerably from the printed ed. by
Montfaucon (op.cit., 733-6).
18. 763c-764b. "Spiritus ante Dominum" .. "incircumscripta
est". Paterius in III Reg. X, XI (op.cit., 810-11).
19. 764b-766b. "Et dixit Dominus ad Heliam" .. "et vitia
universa, atque peccata".
20. 766b-c. "Certum est" ... "aperta nesciebat".
Paterius in III Reg. XII (op.cit., 811-12).
21. 766c-767a. "Helias reperit Heliseum" .. "sed secundum
spiritum".
22. 767a-d. "Quod Benedad rex Syriae" .. "domum rediit".
Bede XXX Quest. XVII (op.cit., 310-11).
23. 767d-768a. "Benadab Regem Syriae" .. "conflictum
habuit".
24. 768a-769a. "Quid per solium" .. "nolentes trahant".
Paterius in III Reg. XIII (op.cit., 812).
25. 769a-c. "Sed quo modo Deus" .. "longissimum est".
Aug. ad Simplic. II, 6 (2nd half) (op.cit., 146-8).
26. 769c--. "Post mortem Achab" .. "fastu intereunt".
27. 769c-d. "Figuraliter, autem quinquagenarius" ..
"meruit pervenire". Isidore, Quest IV Reg. I
(op.cit., 419).
28. 769d-770c. "Sciendum est quod" .. "sumpta iaculatur".
Gregory, Moralia IV, I (MPL LXXIII, 638-9).
29. 770c-771a. "Quod enim abstrahendus" .. "est collatum".

30. 771a-b. "Curus Israel" .. "admonitionibus exercet".
?Gregory Homilae in Ezechiel II, 9 in MPL LXXVI, 1052.
31. 771b-d. "Quid est quod Helias" .. "continebat et coelum". Paterius in IV Reg. I (first part only) (op.cit., 813) omitting a section in praise of celibacy.
32. 771d-772b. "Neque enim arbitrandum" .. "feliccius mutarentur". Aug. de Genesi ad litteram IX, 6 (C.S.E.L. XXVIII, 3, 1, 274).
33. 772c-d. "Apprehenditque vestimenta" .. "mundo reliquit".
34. 772d-773a. "Civitas Hierico" .. "Domini intelligitur".
?based on Isidore Quest. IV Reg. II (op.cit., 419).
35. 773b-c. "Heliseus qui interpretatur" .. "transtulit regnum". Isidore Quest. IV Reg. III (op.cit., 419-20) with alterations.
36. 773c-774c. "Mulier quaedam" .. "virtutum exprimitur".
?using Paterius in IV Reg. II (op.cit., 814).
37. 774c-775a. "auctor humani generis" .. "ad vitam rediit".
Paterius, in IV Reg. III (op.cit., 815).
38. 775a-777b. "Naaman vero princeps" .. "portare non renuit".
Caesarius, Sermones CXXIX 3-6a (C.C. CIII, 531-4)
N.B. 776d-777a "Et prima stola - salus cognoscitur attributa" is not in the printed ed. of Caesarius.
39. 777c-778c. "Si enim propheta" .. "ubique tota est".
Aug. de Civit. XXII, 29 (op.cit., 858-9).
40. 778c-778d. "Sicut enim Giezi" .. "lepra fuisse perfusos".
Caesarius Sermones CXXIX, I (op.cit., 531)
N.B. 778d "omnes malos sacerdotes intra Ecclesiam intus" has replaced the printed text of "omnes avaros et cupidos intus".
41. 778d-779b. "Qui contra dominica" .. "et natavit ferrum".
42. 779b-c. "Dominus Jesus" .. "redeunte surrexit".
Isidore, Quest. IV Reg. V (op.cit., 420).
43. 779c-780b. "Sive aliter; Eliseus namque" .. "Domini reddimur". Caesarius, Sermones CXXX, 1-2 (op.cit., 535-6).
44. 780b-781a. "Item moraliter; Ferrum in manubrio" ..
"reddendi cogitatur". Paterius, in IV Reg. IV (op.cit., 815-6).

45. 781a-c. "Rex autem Syriae" .. "non quaesiverunt".
46. 781c-782a. "Factum est autem" .. "procul dubio figuravit".
47. 782a-b. "Quatuor ergo viri erant leprosi" .. "conculcatus est".
48. 782c-d. "Eliseus autem locutus" .. "omnis Israel salvus fiet".
49. 782d-785b. "Anno septimo misit Joadā" .. "singuli arma sua, etc.". Bede XXX Quest. XVIII (op.cit., 311-13).
50. 785b-c. "Quod sequitur de eodem" .. "debere meminisset". Bede, XXX Quest. XIX (op.cit., 313-4.)
51. 785c-d. "Quod instaurantibus" .. "opus esset, offerent". Bede XXX Quest. XX (op.cit., 314).
52. 785d-786b. "Post haec mortuus est" .. "vivere cum Christo".
53. 786b-c. "Quod dicitur de Amasia" .. "Deo adiuvante ceperit". Bede XXX Quest. XXI (op.cit., 314).
54. 786c-d. "Quod dicitur de Hieroboam" .. "ad vicina Sodomorum praetenditur". Bede XXX Quest. XXII (op.cit., 315).
55. 787a-b. "Quod dicitur de his" .. "idola fuerunt Evaeorum". Bede XXX Quest. XXIII (op.cit., 315).
56. 787c-788d. "Anno quarto decimo" .. "quam in frugibus". Jerome in Esaiam XI (xxxvi) (C.C. ed. LXXIII 429-433) N.B. Claudius has cut out about two-thirds of the total in Jerome's commentary in this and the succeeding passages.
57. 788d-789b. "Quodque infert; ubi est Deus Emath" .. "vertit interpres". Bede XXX Quest. XXIV (op.cit., 316).
58. 789b-c. "Tacuitque omnis populus" .. "filium Amos". Jerome in Esaiam XI (xxxvii, 1-7) (op.cit., 434-5.)
59. 789d-790a. "Haec iuxta litteram" .. "operis non producit". Paterius in IV Reg. V (op.cit., 816).
60. 790b-792d. "Si forte audiat" .. "pomis densissimis impleantur". Jerome in Esaiam XI (xxxvii, 1-20) (op.cit., 435-8).
61. 792d-793a. "Quid hoc loco" .. "retributio reddatur". Paterius, in IV Reg. VII (op.cit., 816).

62. 793a-c. "De Hierusalem" .. "paulo ante contempserat".
Jerome, in Esaiam XI (xxxvii, 36-38) (op.cit., 441-2).
63. 793c. "De talibus autem rebus" .. "sicut angelos".
Cf. Aug. de Trinit. XV, 22 (ch. 13) (C.C. LA, 494).
64. 793c-d. "nec aliqua" .. "quia novit".
(as above).
65. 794a-b. "Cum enim rex" .. "imminent campis".
Jerome in Esaiam (xxxvii, 36-38) (op.cit., 442).
66. 794c-795a. "nulla quae in hoc mundo" .. "intus statutum".
Paterius, in IV Reg. VIII (op.cit., 816-7).
67. 795a-c. "Convertitque Ezechias" .. "semine nasciturum".
Jerome in Esaiam XI (xxxviii, 1-3) (op.cit., 443).
68. 795c-796a. "Plerumque enim" .. "corde proferuntur".
Paterius in IV Reg. IX (op.cit., 817).
69. 796a-b. "Et factum est verbum" .. "in oculis eius
fecerat". Jerome in Esaiam XI (xxxviii, 4-8)
(op.cit., 444).
70. 796b-d. "Secundum quasdam causas" .. "transeunt
beatitudinem". Aug. de Genesi ad litteram VI, 17
(op.cit., 191-2).
71. 797a-c. "Idem nomen graduum" .. "ab occasu redire".
Bede XXX Quest. XXV (op.cit., 316-7).
72. 797c-798b. "Vel certe decem" .. "tectata denudans".
Isidore Quest. IV Reg. VI, 4-6 (op.cit., 421).
73. 798b-800a. "In tempore illo" .. "non dubium est".
Jerome in Esaiam XI, 39 (op.cit., 451-2).
74. 800a-b. "Eunuchos enim, id est abscissos" .. "non
fuerunt".
75. 800b-801c. "Quid hoc loco" .. "incursione perdamus".
Paterius, in IV Reg. X (op.cit., 817-8).
76. 801c-802b. "Duodecim annorum erat Manasses" ..
"denuo reparetur".
77. 802b-c. "Post aliquanta" .. "intelligere debemus".
Bede XXX Quest. XXVI (op.cit., 317) with some
rearrangement.
78. 802c-804b. "Haec dicit Dominus" .. "non cognovit nos".
Aug. de cura pro mortuis gerenda XIII-XIV (op.cit.,
648-50).

79. 804b-805b. "Contaminavit quoque" .. "locus appareret".
Bede XXX Quest. XXVII (op.cit., 317-8).
80. 805b-d. "Quod sequitur" .. "minus stulti parerent".
Bede XXX Quest. XXVIII (op.cit., 318-9).
81. 806a-c. "Quod paulo post" .. "attingere videretur".
Bede XXX Quest. XXIX (op.cit., 319-20).
82. 806c-808a. "Quod referens de Nabuchodonosor" .. "opera
converti". Bede XXX Quest. XXX (op.cit., 320-22).
83. 808b-c. "Dum Scriptura sacra" .. "multitudine gravatur".
Paterius in IV Reg. XI (op.cit., 818-20).
84. 808c-d. "Sicut enim quarta die" .. "in Babyloniam
translata". ?using Aug. de Civit. XVI, 43. (op.cit.,
550).
85. 809a. "Quae Quarta saeculi" .. "solet existere".
Bede de Temporum Ratione LXVI (MGH A.A. XIII, 248).
86. 809a-810d. "Sedechias autem suprascriptus" ..
"figurae nostrae fuerunt".

Passages not identified

1. 637b-c "Fuit vir unus... Hic Isaar pater fuit Chore...
Cethsaim et Betheron"
I Sam. I,1 12 lines. A family tree and geographical data with biblical references.
Cf. Bede XXX Quaest. I,1 and Isidore Appendix ad Libros Regum in MPL LXXXIII, 425-6.
2. 645b "Hoc canticum iuxta septuaginta... continet historiam"
I Sam. II,1f 5 lines. A brief note by Claudius explaining that Augustine's exposition of the song of Hannah is based on the Old Latin text which he calls the Septuagint.
3. 650a-b "Factum est autem... lumen amisit"
I Sam. III, 2-3 15 lines. On the dimness of Eli's sight. Written probably by Claudius. Theutmir asked for an explanation of the passage. Hrabanus' commentary contains similar material (MPL CIX, 25) but is not dependent on Claudius' exposition.
4. 653a "Isti ab hoc percussi... temeritate mulctati sunt".
I Sam. VI,19 7 lines. The men of Beth Shemesh are killed because they despexerunt into the Ark. Written by Claudius who draws the word "despexerunt" from "alia translatio".
5. 654b "Cariathiarim.... sicut Hieremias scribit".
I Sam. VII, 2 6 lines. A geographical note written by Claudius possibly on the basis of Isidore I Reg IV.
6. 657d-658d "Filius unius anni... lucra vocantur, et quaestus".
I Sam. XIII, 1,13-14 1 column. About Saul's first three years of rule, his disobedience and Samuel's rejection of him. It seems too well written to be attributed to Claudius. No.14 of the passages requested by Theutmir.
7. 659c "Iniit autem Saul... Evilath... ex Aegypti confinio".
I Sam. XV,7 10 lines. A geographical note with biblical references. Bede's Nomina locorum (C.C. CXIX, 278) provides the same information but is worded differently. Claudius interprets the meaning of the passage differently from Bede.

8. 666c "Sumpsit ergo Samuel... interimere voluerat".
I Sam. XV, 33 11 lines. God's command
to kill Agag. No. 18 of the passages requested
by Theutmir.
9. 689b-690b "Nec tibi absurdum... quid egerit pertinebit".
II Sam. I, 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ column. An explanation
giving examples how evil actions can signify good
and vice versa. Since this is passage No. 25
requested by Theutmir, I think Claudius must be
considered the author.
10. 702c-703a "Factum est autem... stare valeant".
II Sam. X, 1f. $\frac{1}{2}$ column. A long biblical
passage followed by a short allegorical section
about the messengers sent to the King of the
Ammonites. Hrabanus' exposition of the same
passage uses similar interpretations but the
vocabulary used is entirely different (Cf. MPL
CIX, 97 and 371-2).
11. 706c-707d "Quod vero dicit... emendatione sanari".
II Sam. XII, 1. 1 column. Nathan and
David. No source can be identified. Trombelli
suggests "Quae sequuntur, videntur ex Augustino
desumpta, sed locum invenire non potui".
12. 734c-735b "Deinde sequitur.... Tabernaculo
reservandum".
I Kings VIII, 9. $\frac{1}{2}$ column. The contents
of the Ark. Refs. to Hebr. IX, 4 and to two
O.T. passages made up most of this section.
Perhaps written by Claudius.
13. 736a-c "Post perfectum omne opus... doctrinam perciperet
veritatis".
I Kings IX, 26-8. $\frac{1}{2}$ column. Notes on
"Asyongaber" and Ophir. The Queen of Sheba comes
from India. There is a reference to Josephus.
14. 738c-739a "Fecit etiam rex.... duodecim tribus Israel".
I Kings X, 18. 20 lines. On the throne
of Solomon. The phrase "Dominicus Homo" is noted
by Trombelli as Nestorian when taken by itself.
15. 739a-b "Post aliquanta.... in civitate Jerusalem".
I Kings X, 27. 15 lines. A grammatical note
on hyperbole.
16. 739b-c "Rex autem Salomon amavit... esse cognovit".
I Kings XI, 1. 20 lines. A warning from
the example of Solomon to all those who prosper.
Probably composed by Claudius.

17. 740b "Quod vero unitas pallii... subditam detinent".
I Kings XI, 30. 7 lines. The torn robe represents the unity of the Church broken by heresy. This may be a passage from a work referring to the torn robe of Christ (Cf. John XIX, 23-4).
18. 745a-746b "Lucus, locus est silvester spissus... usque ad pedes".
I Kings XVI, 29-33. 1½ columns. Ahab and Jezebel worship Baal. a lively sermon in good Latin.
19. 749a-c "Postquam vero exsiccatus... substantiam procuraret".
I Kings XVII, 7f. ½ column. A long Bible passage followed by a short summary of the part of the story not dealt with. This was probably written by Claudius Cf. the similar passage at 744d.
20. 764b-766a "Et dixit Dominus ad Heliam... et vitia universa atque peccata".
I Kings XIX, 15. 2 columns. The allegorical interpretation of various names.
21. 766c-767a "Helias reperit Heliseum... sed secundum spiritum".
I Kings XIX, 19. 25 lines. Allegorical interpretations possibly by Claudius.
22. 767d-768a "Benadab Regem Syriae... conflictum habuit".
I Kings XX, 1. 8 lines. Allegorical interpretation possibly by Claudius Cf. the similar passage at 764b.
23. 769b-c "Post mortem Achab... fastu intereunt".
II Kings I, 2. 12 lines. Allegorical interpretation possibly by Claudius.
24. 770c-771a "Quod enim abstrahendus... est collatum".
II Kings II, 2, 4, 9. 20 lines. A summary of events with allegorical interpretations. Possibly by Claudius.
25. 772c "Apprehenditque vestimenta... mundo reliquit".
II Kings II, 13. 11 lines. Allegorical interpretation.
26. 778d-779b. "qui contra dominica... natavit ferrum".
II Kings V, 20-VI, 7. 30 lines. Claudius alters the conclusion of Caesarius' sermon by applying the condemnation of Gehazi to priests who demand money for their services. Gehazi is also identified as a type of the Jews. This is probably by Claudius.

27. 781a-c "Rex autem Syriae... non quaesiverunt".
II Kings VI, 8. 24 lines. The king of
Syria is a type of the Devil.
28. 781c-782a "Factum est autem... procul dubio
figuravit".
II Kings VI, 24. 30 lines. Famine during
the siege of Jerusalem.
29. 782a-c. "Quatuor ergo viri... conculcatus est."
II Kings VII, 3. 18 lines. The lepers go to
the enemy camp. Allegorical interpretations.
30. 782c "Eliseus autem locutus... omnis Israel salvus
fiet".
II Kings VIII, 1. 14 lines. Allegorical
interpretation of the Shunamite woman.
31. 785d-786b "Post haec mortuus est... vivere cum Christo".
II Kings XIII, 20-21. 25 lines. Allegorical
interpretation of the dead body revived by
touching the bones of Elisha.
32. 800a-b "Eunuchos enim, id est abscissos... non fuerunt".
II Kings XX, 18. 11 lines. Eunuchs used
as a name for palace servants.
33. 801c-802b "Duodecim annorum erat Manasses... denuo
reparetur".
II Kings XXI, 1. $\frac{1}{2}$ column. The man of
God must have no part in divination, etc.
34. 809a-810c "Sedechias autem suprascriptus... figurae
nostrae fuerunt".
II Kings XXV, 1f. $1\frac{1}{2}$ columns. A summary of
the end of the Kingdom of Judah followed by an
allegorical interpretation of the Exile. The
events of the fall of Jerusalem are dated in a
way similar to that of the Chronica Brevis (see
Appendix I).

Chapter Six

(In this chapter Q.I, II, etc., refer to the sections of the appendix to the main commentary, i.e. MPL CIV, 809-34.

q. 1,2, etc., refer to the passages from Samuel and Kings listed by Theutmir in his introductory letter, i.e. ibid., 627-34).

The main commentary on Samuel and Kings ends with the words, "All these things are symbols for us also".¹ The sentence makes a fitting conclusion for a commentary that consists almost entirely of allegorical exegesis. There are however another thirty-four columns of print in the Migne edition² which form a supplement or appendix to the commentary. This section consists of a letter to Theutmir, the dedicatee of the commentary, followed by about forty short paragraphs explaining the meaning of passages from Samuel and Kings. Claudius' quaestiones, as they may fitly be called, are like the sets of quaestiones written by Bede, Isidore and others. In a set of quaestiones there is no attempt to explain the meaning of a whole book of the Bible. Selected passages only are discussed.

Claudius described how he had come to write the appendix in the brief letter to Theutmir with which it opens. In his original letter Theutmir had sent a list of seventy-two passages from Samuel and Kings for which he wished to have

1. MPL CIV, 810.

2. ibid., 809-34.

explanations like those that Bede had written for Nothelm in his XXX Quaestiones. Claudius did not send the LXXII Quaestiones that Theutmir had requested. Instead he wrote a full length commentary on the four books.

Many of the passages which had puzzled Theutmir had received interpretations in the course of the main commentary. In the appendix Claudius was now prepared to deal with as many of those that remained as he could. The reason given by Claudius for not including the explanations now offered in the appendix was that he had not wished to mix the spiritual flowers of allegory with the bare questions of literal interpretation.³ He also said that some questions would have to remain unanswered since he had not been able to find suitable material either in the books of ancient times or in those of his elders.

Claudius had completed the main commentary and was in the middle of writing the appendix when he received a letter from Aix which told him that Theutmir had accused Claudius of false doctrine and had submitted the commentary on I and II Corinthians to the judgement of a synod.⁴ Claudius composed the second part of the introductory letter to the appendix while still in a white-hot rage; in it he called on God to punish the presumption of Theutmir.

In view of these events one ought to consider whether the passages chosen by Theutmir contained any bias or were intended to elicit answers that might be used as evidence

3. MGH EpKA II, 608.

4. ibid., 609.

against Claudius. After an examination of the passages and the answers given by Claudius I consider that the questions were posed in good faith, with the intention of finding answers to questions that would puzzle a thoughtful reader. Many are questions that one would still ask today. Since the most recent event that Theutmir spoke of in his letter is the arrival of Claudius' commentary on Exodus, published in 821,⁵ I think that Theutmir wrote the letter before he had come to doubt the orthodoxy of his friend.

The questions posed were sometimes intended to elicit a particular kind of answer. Question 45 asks for the interpretation of the two harlots who brought a baby before Solomon for judgement. Theutmir would undoubtedly have expected to receive an allegorical interpretation. Claudius in the main commentary quoted one passage from Isidore and another from Paterius, i.e. Gregory the Great, both of which interpret the story in allegorical terms.⁶

Most of the questions chosen by Theutmir seem however to need a literal interpretation. What was the wood called "thina"; what and where was the "Ophir" from which it came? What is meant when the Bible says that there was as much silver as stone in Solomon's Jerusalem? What was the "ephod" worn by Samuel?⁷ One question which reveals the common sense attitude of many of the questions is where Theutmir asks how

5. ibid., 605.

6. MPL CIV, 724-725.

7. q. 52; 55; 4.

the altar of burnt offerings was not destroyed by the fire burning constantly on it, since it was made of wood covered with bronze.⁸

In the main commentary Claudius offered interpretations for forty-one of the passages chosen by Theutmir.⁹ In the appendix he gave second interpretations for thirteen of those forty-one passages, repeating what he had said in different words or giving new information. He dealt with a further twenty-three in the appendix. That left eight passages for which he did not give a direct interpretation, although some of these did receive partial answers in the exegesis of other parts of Samuel and Kings.

Most of these eight questions for which no answers were given refer to historical events or ancient customs. The story of Hazael murdering his father, the King of Syria,¹⁰ is couched in rather obscure language and was not likely to attract the attention of an exegete looking for improving stories. It is not surprising that Claudius could not find an interpretation for the passage in patristic writings. When Adonijah asked for permission to marry Abishag, his father's nurse, and when Solomon replied to the request, "May the Lord do so to me and more also,..." the meaning of what they were saying was clear to their contemporaries, but not to men of the Middle Ages or to ordinary readers today.¹¹

8. q. 53.

9. See the lists at the end of the chapter.

10. q. 62.

11. q. 43.

Although Theutmir had already conjectured that the form of words used by Solomon was an oath, Claudius did not attempt an answer to the question.

Several of the unanswered questions may be said to have been answered indirectly. The very last, q. 72, deals with the favour shown to Jehoiakin, King of Judah, during the exile in Babylon. The end of Claudius' main commentary describes the Jews living at peace in Babylon, with the promise of the return from exile. There is no mention of King Jehoiakin, but the mood of the passage is in harmony with the question asked by Theutmir.¹²

One very famous passage in I Samuel might be said to be dealt with in a similar way. Neither Claudius nor Hrabanus could find any suitable patristic exegesis for the story of the call of Samuel, if one may judge from the brief and inadequate paragraphs they each wrote on that. All that Claudius could provide was a few uninspired lines about the dimness of Eli's sight.¹³

Another of the questions by Theutmir concerns the "Idola (Vulgate "aedicula") effeminatorum" which had been placed in the Temple.¹⁴ A partial answer to the question may be found in Q.XXX. This deals with the phrase, "They did what was evil in the sight of the Lord", which is repeated about almost all of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Claudius

12. ibid., 808-810.

13. q. 8; Claudius' exegesis is in MPL CIV, 650a-b; Hrabanus' is in MPL CIX, 25.

14. q. 69; II Kings XXIII, 7.

began his interpretation by saying that Theutmir ought to have asked for an explanation of the phrase. He explained that the false worship of idols was the subject intended by the author. It may be presumed that since Claudius had no detailed information about the "idola" of q. 69, he did not attempt to answer that question.

When one examines the answers to Theutmir's questions, one finds the answers are as various as the questions. It is not true that Claudius kept all literal interpretations of Theutmir's questions for the appendix as he suggested in the introductory letter to the appendix. Both the main commentary and the appendix contain a mixture of literal and allegorical interpretations.

There is however one kind of biblical study which is found more frequently in the appendix than in the main commentary. This is the study of textual variants. In the introduction Theutmir had probably used more than one version of the Bible since the text he quotes usually agrees with the Vulgate, but sometimes is quite different.

During the last years of the eighth century Alcuin and Theodulf of Orléans had been engaged in the revision of the text of the Bible; the Carolingian period was the age when the Vulgate text of Jerome replaced the Old Latin versions almost completely. Claudius was born in Spain which was textually conservative. Both he and Theutmir probably grew up hearing an Old Latin text, or a Vulgate text corrupted by Old Latin readings, read to them in church and taught to them in school. As they became adult and entered into a deeper study of the sacred text they would discover that scholars

preferred a different and more accurate version.

Some of the quaestiones deal almost entirely with the different texts of a passage that were available to Claudius. In the main commentary Claudius had occasionally, e.g. MPL CIV, 653; L, 1132, mentioned textual variants. In the appendix he referred frequently to the Septuaginta, an antiqua translatio and an alia translatio.

When one looks at the way in which Claudius used the textual information available to him, one must remember that it was only in the period of the Enlightenment that textual criticism began to be a precise science. Even Origen, the greatest critic of the Bible in the Early Church, set the Septuagint and other versions of the Old Testament side by side and commented on the texts of all of them." The habit of making double commentaries on double texts without choosing between them will become ingrained".¹⁵ Augustine thought that it was not so much the words of the Bible themselves as the doctrine underlying the words that was important. "The words express the doctrine and if they declare it in various ways, there is no necessity to set one version against another, any more than it is necessary to prefer one exegesis of a given text to another."¹⁶ Augustine believed that the obscurities were good because they made readers work hard to find the truth.

In the quaestiones Claudius placed two or more texts one after the other but did not attempt to choose between them.

15. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, 13.

16. G. Bonner in Cambridge History of the Bible I, 547 referring to Augustine. de Doctr. Christ. II, 6, 7.

In the main commentary when calculating a date Claudius did speak of Hebraica veritas, but included the reckoning iuxta Septuaginta as well.¹⁷ This passage cannot however be taken as Claudius' own opinion on the subject since it is a quotation from Bede's de Temporum Ratione.¹⁸

In the appendix there are six quotations from a source labelled the Septuaginta,¹⁹ four from an antiqua translatio,²⁰ three from alia translatio,²¹ and in two quaestiones there are passages from diversae translationes.²² Claudius said that he had searched antiquae translationes for the etymology of Nabas (Vulgate Nohestan) in Q. XXXVI. Another use of the same phrase is to be found in the introductory letter.²³

For the text of Psalm XXXIII, 8, Claudius preferred an emendatiorem translationem,²⁴ i.e. the Psalterium Romanum, to the Psalterium Gallicanum which was regularly in use north of the Alps at this period. There is therefore a considerable amount of material in the appendix about the text of the Bible.

It would be useful to know whether Claudius was referring to a particular manuscript in his hands when he wrote of the Septuaginta, and the other translationes that he mentioned. The information about the textual families and groupings of Old Latin texts is so fragmentary that even brief

17. MPL CIV, 809.

18. MGH A.A., XIII, 248.

19. QQ. I, XII, XXIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXI.

20. QQ. VIII, XIX, XXIII, XXVII.

21. QQ. XXIII, XXVIII, XXIX.

22. QQ. III, XVIII.

23. MPL CIV, 810d.

24. Q. XXXVII.

extracts might be of value. In the absence of the volumes of the Vetus Latina and Vetus Latina Hispana dealing with Samuel and Kings the essential tools are lacking for a study of the variants given by Claudius. No useful information has been gleaned from Sabatier's Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae.

However it is probably not worth while to speculate whether Claudius did refer to one manuscript as the Septuaginta, or another as alia translatio. Some of the quotations may have come from the works of one of the Fathers. Others may not have been quoted exactly. The passage from Deut. XIX in Q. XXIII is one case where Claudius appears to have paraphrased or quoted from memory the text of the Bible.

In Q. XXVIII and Q. XXIX Claudius has given long quotations from two different texts of the Old Latin, and added the Vulgate text of the same passage in Q. XXIX for good measure. In this case at least one might believe that he copied directly from two manuscripts before him. I have replaced Claudius' Vulgate text with that of a modern edition,²⁵ but the differences between that and Claudius' are very slight.

25. Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam VI (Rome, 1945).

<u>Vulgate</u>	<u>Septuaginta</u>	<u>alia translatio</u>
Sed et classis Hiram quae portabat aurum	Et navis Hiram quae attulerat aurum	Et navis Hiram quae attulit aurum
de Ophir attulit ex Ophir ligna thyina multa nimis et gemmas pretiosas	ex Ophyr attulit etiam trabes non dolatas multas valde et lapides pretiosos.	et sephoram, attulit trabes multas valde, non dolatas, et lapides pretiosos.
fecitque rex de lignis thyinis fulchra domus	Et fecit rex ex trabibus non dolatis his firmamenta domus	et fecit rex de lignis non dolatis inflaturam domus
Domini et domus regiae et citharas lyrasque cantoribus non sunt	Domini et domus regis et nablas et cynniras cantoribus. Non sunt	Domini et domus regis et nablas et ambucos in canticis; non
adlata huiusce modi ligna thyina	inventa talia ligna non dolata in terris,	exierunt talia ligna
neque visa usque in praesentem diem.	neque visa usque in die hanc.	nec usque in hunc diem.
III Reg. X, 11-12		Q. XXVIII

<u>Vulgate</u>	<u>Septuaginta</u>	<u>alia translatio</u>
Fecit quoque	Et fecit	Et fecit
rex Salomon ducenta	Salomon trecentas	rex Salomon trecentas
scuta* de auro puro	hastas aureas ductiles.	lanceas aureas ductiles.
sescentos	Trecenti	Ducenti quinquaginta
auri siclos dedit in lamminas	aurei inerant in	aurei inerant in
scuti unius	hasta	lancea una,
et trecentas peltas**	et trecenta scuta	et trecenta scuta
ex auro probato	aurea ductilia.	aurea
trecentae minae	Trecentas minas	trecenteni
auri unam peltam	auri habebat in uno	aurei in scuto uno.
vestiebant. . .	scuto.	

* ducentas hastas in Θ^G
(Paris Nat, Lat 11937 (S.IX))

** trecenta scuta in Θ^G

(Θ^G is the manuscript to which a disciple of Theodulf added readings from the Hebrew text; see S. Berger Histoire de la Vulgate, 178f).

III Reg.X, 16-17

Q. XXIX

Claudius' commentary on Ruth also contains a number of readings from the Old Latin text of the Bible. It is possible that his commentaries may yield a rich harvest of new readings from the Old Latin when they have all been examined carefully.

The main commentary contains a few details of grammar, some of which may have been written by Claudius himself. A brief paragraph in the main commentary about the abundance of

silver in Solomon's Jerusalem has not so far been traced to an earlier source, and since it relates to a question asked by Theutmir I think it must have been composed by Claudius himself. The passage is about figures of speech and Hyperbole in particular.

Two quaestiones in the appendix deal with similar matters. In Q. XV Claudius pointed out that the language used by King David in his elegy for Saul and Jonathan was exaggerated. Q. XXIV, about the tale of the Thistle and the Cedar of Lebanon,²⁶ provided Claudius with an opportunity to display his knowledge of tropes, metaphors and figures of speech.

Explanations of unusual words were also given. Theutmir had wondered what the arx of Jerusalem was. Claudius enlightened him in Q. XVII. In Q. VIII is a discussion on the word siccine. Claudius quoted the text of Deut. XXXII, 5 in one of the versions known to him, which used the word haeccine. He also noted that an antiqua translatio used haec instead. Although haeccine is the version in the Vulgate, the remainder of the text of Deut. quoted by Claudius is a mixture of Vulgate and Old Latin.

In Q. XXX there is a discussion of the etymologies of simulachrum and idolum. Claudius provided a list of synonyms for the former and a derivation of the latter from the Greek "ἰδως". He said that there were some people ignorant of Greek who derived idolum from dolus.

26. II Kings XIV, 9.

Claudius' knowledge of the geography of Palestine was confined to the Bible, the geographical gazetteers by Bede, and possibly Jerome, and to incidental references in other Patristic writings. There is no evidence of independent knowledge of Adamnan's de Locis Sanctis, although most of the information in that is found in Bede's works. Claudius certainly did not display the easy familiarity with geographical detail that Bede possessed.

In the main commentary there are short summaries of geographical detail probably taken from Bede, e.g. MPL, CIV, 659, 736. In the appendix Q. XIV contains a description of Ceila for which the source was cited by Claudius as the liber locorum. The passage is from Bede's Nomina locorum sanctorum.²⁷ I have not so far been able to trace the source of a short passage about Mount Lebanon in Q. XXIX.

Apart from brief summaries of biblical evidence there is no historical information in the appendix. However there is a considerable amount of miscellaneous information about the background to the Bible. Claudius had been asked about the Kenites in q. 17. In his answer in Q. VII he was able to say who they were, using references to them in other books of the Bible. Q. II is a description of the ephod.

Q. XIX describes the Greek system of coinage and mentions the tribe of the Amazons. Claudius said that the information about the shields of the Amazons was not reliable since it came from the physici. The use of this word to describe "natural philosophers" or perhaps encyclopaedists

27. C.C. CXIX, 276.

like Pliny is an unusual one in the early middle ages. Physici in the normal Late Latin sense of physicians provided the answers to two other quaestiones. Claudius named the physici as the source of his information about the melancholic humour in his discussion of the impotence of the aged King David in Q. XXII. Part of Q. XXIII is about gonoria and tysis, i.e. tuberculosis. This information came according to Claudius, from the Graeci and was not drawn, as one might have expected, from the Etymologiae of Isidore. Claudius must have had access to a medical treatise of some kind to provide these pieces of medical knowledge.

Q. XXXIII is concerned with the high price of food during a siege of Jerusalem. What was the capi stercoris quarta pars? Claudius conjectured that this must refer to the contents of the crop of a pigeon. With becoming modesty he said that this was only his own suggestion, and added, "If however you can find out anything better on this subject, please let me know".

Q. XXVI is about the wooden altar that remained undamaged in spite of the fire burning constantly on it. Claudius' answer was the obvious one for someone with his knowledge of and attitude to the Bible. Just as the shoes and clothing of the Israelites did not wear out during the forty years in the Wilderness, so the materials of the Tabernacle, the Ark and the Altar of Incense did not lose their virtus. They would survive to the end of the saeculum safely concealed in the cave where the prophet Jeremiah had placed them.²⁸ From this we are expected to deduce that the

28. II Maccabees II, 5.

Altar of Burnt Offerings would possess similar powers of resistance to the normal processes of this world. In the same quaestio Claudius discussed the position of the Altar of Incense in the Temple and said that he wished he could meet Bede in the flesh to find out certain things that he did not know.

In most of the places where Claudius had already said in the main commentary what a passage "signified", in the appendix he gave nothing but the literal interpretation of the passage. One example is the story of David and Goliath in Q. X. However a few of the "flowers of allegory" are to be found in the appendix. Q.V contains an allegorical interpretation of the two men who met Saul after his anointing by Samuel. Q. VI explains the three anointings of David in an allegorical sense.

Four quaestiones are included in the appendix which discuss passages not mentioned by Theutmir. In one of these, Q. IX, Claudius said that he was replying to Theutmir's question why Samuel was ordered to anoint one of the sons of Jesse, but not specifically David. I can see no sign in Theutmir's list of that question. Q. XI is also about David. Claudius explained that since he had passed over the passage in the main commentary, he now wished to comment on it.

Q. XXX is a brief summary of Claudius' beliefs about the veneration of images. He started from the formula repeated about many of the Kings, "He did evil in the sight of the Lord". Since Claudius had been embroiled with the people of his diocese about images for several years already,

it is not surprising that he felt impelled to write something about it in the commentary.

Q. XXXVII - XXXVIII is an excursus about the omnipotence of God over the powers of evil, taking as its starting point the story of the angel of the Lord who smote the Assyrian host. It could have been included appropriately in the main commentary, but for some reason Claudius placed it in the appendix. It is a cento of quotations from the works of Augustine and Jerome, woven together into a coherent argument. Most of the sources have been identified by Trombelli. I have discovered one more, Jerome's commentary on Isaiah.²⁹

Because of the brevity of the quaestiones and because Claudius paraphrased or quoted his sources from memory, it has not been possible to identify the sources of the appendix with the confidence that one can in the main commentary. An example is the geographical information. Jerome's Onomasticon was used by Bede for his de Locis Sanctis. Apart from Claudius' mention of the "Liber Locorum" and an exact quotation from Bede, which shows that he did know Bede's book, the other passages in Claudius' commentary differ in wording from both Bede and Jerome. Since they do not agree with either Bede or Jerome against the other, one cannot say which of the two was used by Claudius as his source.

While Claudius was engaged in writing the appendix he heard of the treachery of Theutmir. Even if this were not stated in the letter at the beginning of the appendix, it would still be possible to deduce that Claudius and Theutmir

29. V, xvii, 14; C.C. LXXIII, 188.

had ceased to be friends from the appendix itself. Claudius began Q. XIV with a remark about "your exceedingly stupid question". Q. XXX is about images. At the beginning of it Claudius implied that Theutmir ought to have asked a question on that particular passage. Theutmir's quaestiunculi, i.e. "silly little questions", are mentioned at the beginning of Q. XXXI. This is not the usual style of address used by Claudius to his dedicatees. In the introductory letters to other commentaries his expressions of humility seem excessive to modern tastes.

At least one scribe, the writer of G or of one of its ancestors, chose deliberately to omit the appendix when he copied the commentary. What would be the loss to posterity had Claudius never written it, or had it disappeared from all surviving copies? It contains some information of a miscellaneous nature, none of it very original. There are two theological essays, one of which is a mosaic of quotations from the Fathers. The other sheds some light on Claudius' views about images, but lacks the fire and directness of the surviving quotations from Claudius' Apologeticum atque Rescriptum.

The appendix has two merits as a composition. The first is the number of readings from the Old Latin text of the Bible that it contains. Since the surviving witnesses to the Old Latin text of the Old Testament are so few, even these short passages are of considerable value. The second is that it was composed in order to answer specific questions about a part of the Bible that had received comparatively

little study. Claudius had already put into the main commentary the information that his sources provided. Where they had nothing to say on a topic such as the details of the call of Samuel, Claudius did not attempt to fill in the gaps from his own imagination. In the appendix he was writing to satisfy the curiosity of Theutmir about a variety of subjects. That Claudius left so few questions unanswered is a measure of the wide knowledge of the Bible and its background that he possessed.

Theutmir's Quaestiones

Quaestiones answered in the main commentary only

q. 1, 3, 5, -7, 9, 10, 14-16, 19, 24, 26, 27, 32-34, 45, 46, 48, 55-57, 59, 64, 67, 68, 70.

Quaestiones answered in both the main commentary and the appendix

q. 4, 12, 13, 18, 20, 22, 25, 38, 39, 47, 49, 60, 61.

Quaestiones answered in the appendix only

q. 2, 11, 17, 21, 23, 28, 29, 36, 37, 40-42, 44, 50-54, 58, 63, 65, 66, 71.

Quaestiones not answered

q. 8, 30, 31, 35, 43, 62, 69, 72.

Chapter Seven

Introduction

Since there are few commentaries on the Book of Ruth or even references to the book in Patristic and early medieval literature, one may wonder why Claudius of Turin chose to write a commentary on it.

I believe that its composition must be seen as part of a plan to write commentaries on the first twelve books of the Bible, from Genesis to II Kings. Augustine had proposed a scheme of this kind, but had never found time to complete it. Isidore of Seville had made an attempt, but in the Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, "while the treatment of the Hexateuch, especially Genesis, runs to some length, the sections of I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, Esdras and Maccabees are exceedingly brief".¹

We know that Claudius had lectured on the Pentateuch, in the court school of Louis the Pious, and that his commentaries on these books are his lectures. He was told to put the lectures into written form by the Emperor himself.² Since there is no stylistic difference between the commentary on Genesis and that on Samuel and Kings it is possible that Claudius continued his lectures through Joshua and Judges to the end of Kings.

Genesis was published in its final form in 811, Exodus in 821, Leviticus in 823 and Numbers about the same time

1. M.L.W. Laistner, Thought and Letters, 120.

2. MGH EpKA II, 601.

(Exodus and Numbers are now lost). Theutmir, the abbot of Psalmody near Nîmes,³ to whom Claudius had dedicated several works, asked him for short passages of exposition on seventy-two passages from Samuel and Kings. Claudius sent in return a very different work from the one requested. He wrote a full length commentary on the books, in the form of a catena of extracts from the Church Fathers, and added a short section at the end in the form of quaestiones. In that appendix he dealt with some of the questions of Theutmir which had not been answered in the main body of the commentary and a few other points of interest.

Claudius also added a short commentary on the Book of Ruth. "addidi etiam in hoc opere brevem expositiunculam allegoricam in libro Ruth, quod tu non postulasti, quae magis ad librum Iudicum quam ad Regum pertinere videtur".⁴ Since Claudius produced this commentary in 824 and the one on Joshua and Judges in 825-6, he had then completed his grand design. There was no need to write a commentary on Deuteronomy since he had already expounded it ^{its contents} "magna ex parte iuxta litteram et spiritum" in the commentaries on Exodus and Leviticus.⁵

As it was the practice of Claudius to incorporate as much as possible of the work of the Church Fathers in his commentaries, we must next turn our attention to the sources from which Claudius might have been expected to draw. Christian interpretation of the Book of Ruth stems from Jewish

3. Cf. MPL CIV, 1030.

4. MGH EpKA II, 608.

5. ibid., 609.

Rabbinic exegesis. D. Daube noted that there was a resemblance between Ruth as described in Jewish exegesis and Mary, the mother of Jesus, as described in the New Testament. He also said, "Ruth is celebrated both as representative of the true proselyte and as an ancestress of David and the Messiah. Her life is often interpreted as prefiguring Messianic events, and where this is done, Boaz sometimes stands for God himself, or at least speaks and acts as God would."⁶ This typological interpretation underlies the exegesis of Claudius' commentary.

The earliest work upon which Claudius might have drawn is part of a homily on Matthew by Origen where the Latin version of the relevant section is as follows: "Et nomen secundae Ruth. Gentium figuram gerit Ruth, quae relictis patriis Israeliticae genti inserta est. Quaerendum est autem cur lege vetante ne Moabites ingrediatur in Ecclesiam Dei, Ruth Moabites intravit. Hoc inquirens utere his verbis, Iustis lex non est posita sed iniustis et non subditis."⁷ Several parallels to the first sentence can be found in Claudius' commentary; however the same idea is to be found in Isidore's exposition, a work undoubtedly used by Claudius. Since the section about the law not applying to the just does not appear in Claudius' work, it may confidently be asserted that Claudius did not know of this homily.

A more probable source is the works of Ambrose. In the commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Ambrose dealt at some length with the genealogy of Jesus.⁸ When he reached the

6. D. Daube, The Bible and Rabbinic Judaism, 33.

7. MPG XII, 989-90 (Cf. GCS Origenes Werke XII, III, I, 17-18 ed. E. Klostermann, for the Greek text).

8. Luke III, 23-38.

name of Ruth he asked how it was possible for her, a Moabite, to marry Boaz, since Jews were forbidden in Deuteronomy XXIII, 3 to marry Moabites and Ammonites. His answer was the same as that of Origen's homily; the Law does not apply to the righteous man. Ruth is made above the Law because she is holy and pure.⁹

There are verbal similarities between the passages in Ambrose's commentary and that of Claudius. However there is nothing distinctive enough to suggest that Claudius quoted directly from Ambrose's commentary. This conclusion is all the more surprising since Ambrose is referred to by Claudius as one of the sources for his commentary on Matthew.¹⁰

Mlle La Bonnardière can find only four references to the Book of Ruth in the works of Augustine.¹¹ One is in the de Doctrina Christiana.¹² When Augustine discussed the Book of Ruth he said, "uno libello qui appellatur Ruth, qui magis ad Regnorum principium videtur pertinere." It is a sign of Claudius' independence of mind that he disagreed with that opinion expressed by the Father whom he revered above all others. In the introduction to the commentary which I quoted earlier Claudius spoke of his exposition "quae magis ad librum Iudicum quam ad Regum pertinere videtur."¹³

The next reference in Augustine comes from de Bono Viduitatis and was not used by Claudius. The other two are

9. Exp. Ev. sec. Lucam III, 30; in C.C. XIV, 92.

10. MGH EpKA II, 594.

11. Biblia Augustiniana, A.T., II, 55-6.

12. II, VIII, 13; in C.C. XXXII, 39.

13. See n.4.

from the Quaestiones in Heptateuchum. Quaestio XXXV on Deuteronomy is about marriage with foreigners.¹⁴ Augustine said that the marriage of Ruth and Boaz was permitted because it occurred after the tenth generation. Quaestio XLVI discusses the law of levirate marriage.¹⁵ Neither of these passages was utilized by Claudius.

Gregory of Elvira wrote as follows in the Tractatus de Libris Sacrarum Scripturarum; "Ruth itaque Moabita fuit de gente peccatrice, quam beatus Moyses abdicaverat dicens; Moabitae et Amanitae non intrabunt in ecclesiam Dei usque ad decimam generationem (Deut. XXXIII, 3). Booz autem Israelita homo iustus ex generatione patriarcharum de tribu Iuda. Hic ergo ut scriptura testatur, Moabitam nomine Ruth post decimam generationem duxit uxorem ...".¹⁶ This is another witness to the literal tradition of exegesis of the Book of Ruth. Claudius did not make use of this passage.

I have not been able to trace more than one reference to the Book of Ruth in the works of Jerome, but that one is important for the later exegesis of the text. In the Onomasticon, seu Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum he provided explanations of the meaning of the names of the chief characters in the Book of Ruth.¹⁷ I give here the text of the whole passage with parallels from Claudius' commentary opposite.

14. C.C. XXXIII, 294-5.

15. ibid., 301.

16. MPL Supplementum I, 412.

17. C.C. LXXII, 102.

Jerome

Claudius

Booz - in fortitudine

Booz enim qui interpretatur fortitudo (Ms. variant - in fortitudine) seu in quo est virtus (p.8)

Elimelech - deus meus rex

Elimelech qui interpretatur deus rex (p.1)

Jesse - insulae libamen

Maalon - de finestra sive a principiis vel consummatio

Noemi - pulchra

Noemi vero quae interpretatur pulchra (p.2)

Orfa - cervix eius

abicientes igitur iugum legis de suis cervicibus (p.3)

Ruth - videns vel festinans seu deficiens (definiens - veteres aliquot manuscripti)

Ruth interpretatur videns seu definiens atque festinans (p.6)

These interpretations provided a basis for the allegorisations used by Claudius and Hrabanus Maurus in their commentaries.

Cassiodorus noted the absence of a commentary on the Book of Ruth and commissioned the priest Bellator to write one. "In Ruth vero priscas explanationes nequaquam potui reperire. Novellas autem virum religiosissimum presbyterum Bellatorem condere persuasi, qui multa de praeconiis huius feminae aliarumque subsequentium duobus libris copiosa laude celebravit. Quos libros expositionibus Originis forsitan competenter adiunxi, ut explanatio totius codicis Octateuchi consummato termino clauderetur."¹⁸ The homilies by Origen are now lost, unless the passage to which I referred at the

18. Cassiodorus, Institutiones I,2 ed. Mynors, R.A.B. 15.

beginning of the chapter and the passage from Gregory of Elvira are the ones which Cassiodorus added to his manuscript. Bellator's commentary has not survived, unless parts of it are concealed within the commentaries by Isidore, Claudius or Hrabanus Maurus.

The Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum¹⁹ attributed to Chrysostom contains a long section about Ruth and Boaz. The author praised the couple for the humility, simplicity of life and many other good qualities which he thought they possessed. He said that Boaz married Ruth, not because of sexual passion but because of his righteousness and her virtue. The heavy moralising tone of the author is far removed from the simplicity of the "rustic idyll" of the Book of Ruth. It conjures up in one's mind the sophisticated, wealthy society of Late Antiquity and the aristocratic patrons of Jerome and Pelagius. The work is usually attributed to a Pelagian writer. Claudius' commentary does not show any trace of the language or thought of the Opus Imperfectum.

Isidore is the most important source from which Claudius drew his material. Almost a quarter of the commentary was copied word for word from the passage in the Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu quaestiones in vetus Testamentum²⁰ which deals with the Book of Ruth. In the opening paragraph Isidore said that Ruth was a type of the Church, because she left her home and native land among the Gentiles and entered

19. MPG LVI, 618-9.

20. MPL LXXXIII, 390-2.

the land of Israel, and because she said, "Your people will be my people and your God my God, etc."²¹ This section was repeated in other words by Claudius. The rest of the commentary which deals with the last part of the story of Ruth, the betrothal before witnesses, was copied out verbatim.

When we examine Claudius' commentary itself we find that it is an extended allegory. With the assistance of the interpretations in Jerome's Onomasticon Claudius worked out a consistent allegorisation by which the Book of Ruth is made to reveal God's plan of salvation. Elimelech is the Law, Naomi the Synagogue and the two sons are the children of the Law and the Synagogue, Israel and Judah. The family leave Bethlehem, the house of the Bread of Life, because of a famine of the Divine Word. The daughters-in-law represent the two kinds of Gentile, those who accept and those who reject the worship of God. Boaz is Christ who accepts his Gentile bride, the Christian Church.

Claudius' commentary can be compared with that written shortly afterwards by Hrabanus Maurus.²² Hrabanus' commentary is about four times as long. It contains part of the commentary by Isidore quoted verbatim (chapters 2 and 7). Also many of the interpretations chosen are the same as in Claudius' commentary. The famine is not of bread or food, but of the hearing of the word of God "Ob raritatem spiritalium doctorum." Elimelech and Naomi are the Law and the Synagogue. Although the same outline of interpretation is followed there

21. Ruth I, 16.

22. MPL CVIII, 1199-1224.

are differences. The two sons are not identified with the two nations; Orpha is said to represent those of the Jews who were believers.

The commentary by Hrabanus also contains a large amount of new material, mainly allegorical in content. One of these interpretations is strange. Ruth III, 7 contains the words, "And when Boaz had eaten and drunk and his heart was merry, he went to lie down". According to Hrabanus, since Boaz represents Christ, the meal must be the Last Supper, the "hilaritas" is because of the assurance of the Resurrection, and the sleep represents the Crucifixion.²³

There are two passages, not copied from any earlier source that I have examined, where there is a considerable likeness between the commentaries by Claudius and Hrabanus.

Claudius

fames enim quam apud
israeliticum populum factam
scriptura praenuntiat
divini verbi accipienda
est quae propter totius
populi transgressionem
minime a prophetis fiebat
et iuxta quod scriptum est
pretiosus fuerat sermo domini
valde.

Hrabanus

Quid enim significat fames
ista in terra in diebus
iudicis unius? nisi quod ob
raritatem spiritalium doctorum
et magistrorum populi Dei, ...
fames non panis nec cibi sed
audiendi verbum Dei.²⁴

23. Ibid., 1212-3.

24. ibid., 1199.

Et donec ordea	donec hordea et triticum in horreis
colligerentur et triticum	conderentur, id est tandiu adhaesit
veteris videlicet testamenti	doctoribus in meditatione
ac novi didicisset	sacrarum Scripturarum, donec
mysterium immobiliter	Veteris et Novi Testamenti notitiam
vestigiis apostolorum	pleniter in cellaria cordis
adhaesit.	sui recondere... ²⁵

Hrabanus' first passage might be described as a paraphrase of Claudius' version; the second passage contains a similar interpretation and the word "adhaesit".

Since Claudius' commentary was completed a decade before that of Hrabanus, one may postulate either that Hrabanus used Claudius' commentary or that both were drawing upon a common source. The first alternative is attractive and might be paralleled by the use that Hrabanus is thought to have made of Claudius' commentary on Matthew in the composition of his own work on Matthew.²⁶ J.B. Hablitzel came to the conclusion that Hrabanus knew but did not copy directly from Claudius' commentary.

However in an earlier study Hablitzel had examined the relationship between the commentaries on Samuel and Kings by these two authors.²⁷ After an examination of some of the sources used he decided that the two commentaries had arisen

25. ibid., 1211.

26. J.B. Hablitzel, "Hrabanus Maurus und Claudius von Turin" in Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXVIII (1917), 538-52.

27. J.B. Hablitzel, "Hrabanus Maurus und Claudius von Turin" in Historisches Jahrbuch XXVII (1906), 74-85.

independently of each other. From my own studies I agree with that.

Since Claudius' commentary on Ruth was appended to his commentary on Samuel and Kings, it is difficult to believe that Hrabanus would consult the shorter work and ignore the long one completely. It would therefore seem likely that both Claudius and Hrabanus drew independently of each other on an earlier source, which I have not so far been able to identify.

I suggest that this source may be the lost commentary by Bellator or a lost homily by Origen and that this was combined with the passages from Jerome's Onomasticon and from Isidore's Quaestiones. An alternative is to suggest that the two authors consulted a dictionary of allegorical interpretations and used that as a basis for their discussion. The Formulae Spiritualis Intellegentiae of Eucherius²⁸ was not that source since no connection between that work and the commentaries is discernible. Possibly Claudius and Hrabanus built up their interpretations from their general knowledge of the principles of allegorisation and from passages in other Biblical commentaries. Every virtuous woman is a type of the Church. Every pious foreigner is a type of the Gentile believer. Leah and Rachel are types of the Church and the Synagogue in a tradition that starts with Justin Martyr²⁹ and which was not unknown to Claudius.³⁰ With a little practice it would be possible to arrive at the orthodox interpretation of any passage in the Bible according to allegorical principles.

28. C.S.E.L. XXXI, 3-62.

29. R.P.C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, 107.

30. Cf. Claudius' commentary on Genesis in MPL L 1004.

To summarise this study of the exegesis of the Book of Ruth, there are four distinct traditions in its interpretation. First, literal questions about whether the book should be attached to Judges or to Samuel, and about Jewish customs, such as levirate marriage and intermarriage with foreigners, were discussed in the great period of Latin exegesis. Examples have been given from the works of Ambrose and Augustine.

Secondly the moralising tone found most strongly in the Pelagian Opus Imperfectum was not echoed in the works of the early middle ages. Even the fantasies of allegory are in some respects preferable to the distortions introduced by this method of exegesis.

Thirdly the etymology of names which was provided by Jerome's Onomasticon provided a technique of interpretation which was accepted very readily by Claudius and Hrabanus. It provided a link with the most popular tradition of all.

The typological interpretation of Ruth as the Gentile Church accepted by God and brought into the community of Israel springs from Rabbinic exegesis. It is found in its clearest form in the works of Isidore where the same formulas are repeated in several places.³¹ Both of the Carolingian writers followed Isidore's interpretation.

They also followed Isidore in going beyond typology and pressing the details of the story into the mould of allegory. This is comparatively moderate in the commentary by Claudius, but reaches fantastic lengths in the work by Hrabanus.

31. Cf. Allegoriae quaedam Sacrae Scripturae, MPL LXXXIII, 112. Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, ibid., 390.

Claudius' commentary is to be found in three manuscripts and has never been published to my knowledge. Hrabanus' commentary had a wider circulation in the Middle Ages and was the source used by the compilers of the Glossa Ordinaria on Ruth.³²

The three manuscripts of Claudius' commentary are described in Chapter Four of the dissertation. They are:-

Mantua, Biblioteca Comunale C.V.2 XI saec. M

Mons, Bibliothèque Publique 2/225 XII saec. S

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin 17380 (Coll. Navarre)

XIV saec. N

32. MPL CXIII, 531-40.

TEXT

Incipit expositio Claudii Episcopi in libro Ruth.¹

Et factum est in diebus unius iudicis facta est fames
in terra et abiit vir a bethleem iudeae² ut moraretur in agro
moab, ipse et uxor ipsius et duo filii ipsius; et nomen erat
viro elimelech; et nomen erat uxoris³ noemi; et nomen erat
duobus filiis eius maallon et chelleon ephratei. Et profecti
sunt ex bethleem iudeae⁴ et venerunt in agro moab et erant ibi.
Et mortuus est elimelech vir noemi et relictæ est ipsa et duo
filiis eius et acceperunt sibi uxores moabitidas.⁵ Unius
nomen⁶ orpha et secundæ ruth. Et morati sunt ibi quasi decem
annis et mortui sunt ambo filii eius maallon et chelleon.^A

Fames enim quam apud israeliticum populum factam scriptura
 praenuntiat divini verbi accipienda est quæ propter totius
 populi transgressionem, minime a prophetis fiebat et iuxta
 quod scriptum est pretiosus fuerat sermo domini valde.^{7 B}
 Quia declinantibus cunctis nullus repperiri poterat ad quem
 dei fieret⁸ sermo. Ob quod nec nomen iudicis qui illo⁹ in

1. no title in M, Claudii Claudii in N

2. iuda - S; iude - N

3. uxoris eius noemi - M; uxori noemi - S

4. iuda - S; iude - N

5. moabitithas - S

6. nomen uni - M

7. sermo domini omitted by N and S

8. fuerat - N

9. qui in illo tempore - N

A Ruth I, 1-5

B 1 Sam. III, 1 (Not Vulgate)

tempore fuerit historia indicat. Absque rectore enim cuncti
viventes quod libebat uniuersique agere presumebat.^C Vir autem
 elimelech qui interpretatur deus rex mosaycae¹⁰ legis continebat
 figuram per quam deus rerum omnium visibilium quodammodo ac
invisibilium conditor et rector esse cognoscitur.^D noemi vero
 quae interpretatur pulchra synagogae typum gestabat quae
 propter divinum cultum atque notitiam pulchra est appellata.
 Duo quoque filii eorum, legis videlicet et synagogae, duo
 populi id est israel et iuda fuisse noscuntur qui prevalente
 fame divini verbi¹¹ eo quod sacerdotes eorum, ut propheta ait,
in mercede docebant et prophetae eorum futura in muneribus
divinarent.^E *one indic., one subj. ?*

Derelinquentes bethleem quae interpretatur domus panis,
 illius videlicet qui se ad alendas mentes fidelium de caelo
 descendisse testatus est et qui sumentibus se ut ipse ait
confert perpetuam vitam,^F ad externum atque¹² peregrinum et¹³
 sacrilegum transierunt cultum. In quo errore nefario
 remorantibus aliquantulum vir synagogae quem legem fuisse
 superius diximus mortuus scribitur. Lex¹⁴ quippe divina

10. moysaycae - S

11. verbi divini - N, S

12. & - N, S

13. atque - N, S

14. Lex lex quippe - N

C Cf. Judges XXI, 24 (not Vg.)

D Coloss. I, 16

E Micah III, 11 (not Vg.)

F Cf. John VI, 40

transgressoribus, id est a divino cultu deviantibus, non solum peregrinatur verum etiam moritur. Peregrinatur namque his qui eam vitiis omnibus deserviendo contemptui tradunt. Moritur autem illis qui reverentiae cultum creatori deo solummodo debitum demonibus exhibere^G nituntur. Mortua¹⁵ igitur transgressoribus lege¹⁶ remansisse vidua scribitur synagoga cum duobus videlicet populis ob quorum peccata dimisisse matrem illorum synagoga¹⁷ quodammodo deus per prophetam¹⁸ testatus est.

Abicientes igitur iugum legis de suis cervicibus^H et filii belial effecti aliengenis superstitionibus sociati¹⁹ sunt, errori videlicet idolatriae et presentis seculi oblectationibus in quibus libertatem sacrilegam²⁰ exercentes vitam quae illis a deo²¹ fuerat attributa infeliciter amiserunt. Pro quibus per prophetam illis legitur exprobatum a deo. Me, ait, dereliquerunt²² fontem aquae vivae et foderunt sibi lacus qui aquam non valent continere.^I

Noemi ergo quae typum synagogae gestabat et interpretari eam diximus pulchram, post decessum²³ viri sacra quodammodo

15. Mortuam - N

16. legam - N

17. synagoga - N; synagogan - S

18. Prophetas - M

19. satiati - M

20. sacrilegiam - M

21. domino - S

22. dereliquerunt - S

23. discessum - N

G Cf. Romans I, 25

H Jerem. V, 5

I Jerem. II, 13 (Vg. gives cisternas)

legis vidua remanens ac per transgressionis piaculum utriusque populi orbata decimo²⁴ peregrinationis suae anno expleto comperiens, quod²⁵ respexisset dominus populum suum mittendo eis videlicet filium suum qui assumpta carne ex virgine in bethleem civitatem illius dignatus est nasci.

Surrexit ut in patriam cum utraque pergeret nuru de regione videlicet moabitide.²⁶ J Surrexit enim per paenitentiam quae per transgressionem erroris antea iacebat, ac derelicto idolatriae cultu, in quo corruens viduata fuerat atque orbata, ad pristinam regionem ex qua discesserat, divini quodammodo cultus veneratione,²⁷ per eos qui ex iudeis crediderant ac beatos apostolos de quibus propheta legitur predicasse, quam pulchri pedes evangelizantium pacem et²⁸ evangelizantium bona,^K reverti contendit. Quae in itinere iam posita et reverti cupiens²⁹ ad terram iuda,³⁰ id est confessionem domini nostri³¹ ihesu christi, ait ad utramque nurum.

Ite in domum³² matris vestrae faciatque vobiscum³³ dominus misericordiam; detque vobis dominus invenire requiem

24. de timore - S

25. quos - N

26. moabitida - S; moabidine - N

27. divino quodammodo cultu venerationem - S

28. et omitted by S

29. et revertens ad .. - S; et reverti ad- .. - N

30. iudam - S

31. nostri omitted by N and S

32. in domo - M

33. vobis - S

J Ruth I, 6

K Isaiah LII, 7

in domibus virorum quos sortiturae estis. Elevata igitur
voce flere coeperunt. Et orpha osculata socrum statim
reversa est³⁴ L ad populum suum et ad deos suos. Ruth
 vero in typo ecclesiae divini cultus amorem³⁵ concipiens et
 ut psalmista cecinit oblita populi sui et domum patris sui^M
 socrui adherens dixit: Ne averseris³⁶ mihi ut relinquam te et
 abeam. Quocumque enim perrexeris pergam, ubi morata fueris
et ego morabor. Populus tuus populus meus et deus tuus deus
meus. Quae te morientem terra suscepit in ea moriar et ibi
accipiam locum³⁷ sepulturae.^N

= Sic enim ecclesia ex gentibus ad dominum convocata relicta

= patria sua quod est idolatria et omissa universa

= conversatione terrena profitetur dominum deum suum esse in

= quem sancti crediderunt et illuc secuturam³⁸ ubi caro

= christi post passionem ascendit et ob eius nomen in hoc

= saeculo pati usque ad mortem, et cum sanctorum populo

= patriarchis scilicet et prophetis consociandam; de quorum

= societate quod sanctis ex stirpe³⁹ abraham⁴⁰ imminentibus⁴¹

34. socrum est atque reversa ad - N and S

35. amore - S

36. adverseris - S

37. locum accipiam - N and S

38. se added in S

39. tirpe - N

40. habrae - N

41. venientibus - Isidore

= Isidore, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, Ruth, 2
 (MPL LXXXIII, 390-2)

L Ruth I, 8-9

M Psalm XLV, 10

N Ruth I, 16-17

= consociaretur moyses in cantico ostendit dicens, Laetamini
 = gentes cum populo⁴² eius,^O id est hii⁴³ qui ex gentibus
 = estis⁴⁴ credituri cum illis qui primi electi sunt eterna
 = laetitia exultate. ==

Tamen in typo⁴⁵ etiam orphae apud universas gentes
 quae⁴⁶ remanserunt antiquis idolatriae⁴⁷ erroribus et
 voluptatibus servientes intelliguntur.⁴⁸ Nec immerito ergo
 ruth interpretatur videns seu definiens⁴⁹ atque festinans.
 Interiori enim intuitu prospexit vanitatem vanitatum⁵⁰ P
 esse ut scriptum est symulacra demonum⁵¹ deumque celi esse
rerum omnium creatorem atque rectorem,^Q definiensque⁵² in
 corde suo nichil illius amoris penitus proponendum omni mora
 postposita festinare contendit illius cultui sociari. Ob
 quod⁵³ et congrue post modum⁵⁴ virtutis est femina nuncupata.

42. plebe - Isidore

43. hi - S; hii omitted by Isidore

44. istis - Isidore

45. tipo - M

46. quae omitted by N and S

47. ydolatriae - N and S

48. intelliguntur omitted by N and S

49. difiniens - M; difiniens - N

50. vanitantum - M; vanitatum omitted by N

51. demonum symulachra - N and S

52. difiniensque - M; difiniensque - N

53. quem - S

54. p=prae? - added by N and S

== end of Isidore, Ruth, 2

O Deut. XXXII, 43

P Cf. Eccles. I, 2; I Kings XVI, 13, 26.

Q Cf. Leonine Sacramentary (ed. C.L. Feltoe.
 134; Ambrose, Hymn II (MPL XVI, 1409).

Utriusque⁵⁵ ergo mulieris,⁵⁶ socrus videlicet per eos qui ut superius memoravimus crediderant ex iudeis et nurus per eos qui conversi venerunt ex gentibus, velox apud cunctos cives totius videlicet orbis habitatores⁵⁷ illarum fama procrevit.⁵⁸ R

Dicentibusque mulieribus⁵⁹ haec est illa noemi respondisse legitur, ne vocetis me noemi, id est pulchram,⁶⁰ sed vocate me inquit mara, id est amaram quia valde me amaritudine replevit omnipotens.^S Haec humilitatis responsio ad paenitentium personam congrue referenda est. Quamdiu enim quis inviolatam trinitatis retinuerit fidem collatam⁶¹ sibi divinitus pulchritudinis possidet venustatem. Quam si delinquendo amiserit et post modum ad pristinum decorem venire contenderit, necesse est ut per paenitentiam amaritudinem perferat animi quia non poterit quis ad sanitatis pervenire⁶² remedium nisi primitus medicaminum pertulerit cruciatus.

Et reversa est noemi et ruth moabitis nurus eius cum illa quae reversa est de agro moab. Hae⁶³ autem reversae sunt

55. utrequē - N; utraque - S

56. mulieres - N; mulier - S

57. totius orbis videlicet habitatores - N; cives videlicet totius orbis habitatores - S

58. procrebuit - S

59. mulieribus omitted by N

60. pulchra - M

61. conlata - N

62. pervenisse - N

63. hae - M and N

R Ruth I, 19

S Ruth I, 20

initio⁶⁴ messis ordeariae.⁶⁵ T Eo enim tempore etiam ecclesia
ex gentibus ad christi domini venire dinoscitur fidem cum⁶⁶
hi qui veteri testamento serviebant christi fidem per
apostolos recepisse leguntur. Quibus a domino dictum
evangelista prenuntiat, levate oculos vestros et videte quia
iam albae sunt regiones ad messem,^U credentium videlicet
indicans populos.

Dixit autem ruth moabitis ad noemi, Ibo nunc in agrum
ut⁶⁷ colligam spicas de post metentes⁶⁸ cuiuscumque si
invenero gratiam ante oculos eius. Dixit autem ad illam
noemi, Vade filia. Et abiit et veniens collegit in agro de
post metentes.^V

Ruth gentilis in⁶⁹ ecclesiae typo opinione comperta,
labore manuum cupiens victum requirere, id est piis operibus
vitam perpetuam repperire. Non enim se de⁷⁰ his qui ex
iudeis crediderunt ut pote filius sociare audebat. Sed
apostolorum procul sequens vestigia quae ex illorum ore
preferebantur sollicita mente studebat audire.

Accidit autem inquit⁷¹ ut ager ille haberet dominum

64. in initium - N and S

65. ordeareae - N and S

66. cum omitted by N and S

67. ut omitted by N and S

68. metuentes - M

69. in omitted by S

70. de omitted by N and S

71. inquit - N; inquit omitted by M

T Ruth I, 22

U John IV, 35

V Ruth II, 2

booz, qui erat de cognatione elimelech et homo ille potens magnarumque opum dominus erat.^W Booz enim qui interpretatur fortitudo⁷² seu in quo est⁷³ virtus domini nostri gestabat personam, quem psalmista dicit dominum fortem et potentem fuisse in prelio passionis dominumque appellavit⁷⁴ virtutum.^X Quem etiam Paulus apostolus dei sapientiam et virtutem esse^Y testatus est. Quod⁷⁵ eum dicit scriptura de cognatione fuisse elimelech quem interpretari superius diximus deus rex, ad ipsum verbum a quo homo assumptus est dei videlicet filium referendum est, quem dominum esse et regem multis in locis scriptura prenuntiat.

Collegit ergo ruth et quae collegit virga caedens et⁷⁶ excutiens invenit ordei quasi oephi⁷⁷ mensura,⁷⁸ id est tres modios. Quos portans reversa est ad civitatem et ostendit socrui. Insuper et protulit et dedit ei de reliquiis cibi sui quo fuerat saturata. Dixitque socrus sua, Ubi hodie collegisti? Indicavitque ei ubi esset operata et quod precepit⁷⁹ ei booz ut tamdiu messoribus suis⁸⁰ iungeretur

72. in fortitudine - N

73. est omitted by N

74. appellari - N and S

75. autem added by N and S

76. atque - N and S

77. oephy - S

78. mensuram - N

79. precepisset - S

80. eius - N and S

W Ruth II, 3 and 1

X Psalm XXIV, 8

Y I Corinth. I, 24

donec omnes segetes meterentur. Cui respondit noemi,
Benedictus sit a domino quoniam eandem gratiam quam prebuerat
vivis servavit et mortuis. Rursumque propinquus inquit noster
est⁸¹ homo. iuncta est igitur ruth puellis booz, et tamdiu
cum eis messes messuit donec ordea et triticum conderentur in
horreo.⁸² Z

Ecclesia namque ex gentibus ad christi veniens fidem
 et messoribus id est predicatoribus verbi illius adherens,^{AA}
 nec non his quae ab eis in virtute spiritus gerebantur
 sollicite nimis intendens velut catecumina iam effecta de cibo
 quoque illorum ac potu^{BB} hoc est predicationis illorum
 commonitionibus refecta. Quae auditu perceperat mentis
 rigore discutiens unius deitatis atque substantiae beatam
 repperit trinitatem, quam passio fidei suae constringens et
 memoriae evangelicam predicationem quam ab apostolis audierat
 diligenter commendans pergere contendit ad socrum, patriarcharum
 videlicet et prophetarum ex quorum⁸³ illa descendebat⁸⁴ stirpe
 instituta seu exempla avidius volens⁸⁵ addiscere. Et donec
ordea colligerentur et⁸⁶ triticum^{CC} veteris videlicet
testamenti ac novi didicisset⁸⁷ misterium immobiliter

81. noster inquit est - S

82. orreo - N

83. qua - S

84. descenderat - S

85. volens omitted by N

86. colligerentur added by N

87. didicisse - N

Z Ruth II, 17-21, 23.

AA Cf. Ruth II, 9

BB Cf. Ruth II, 14

CC Cf. Ruth II, 23

vestigiiis⁸⁸ apostolorum adhesit.

= Ingressa autem ruth cum socru sua in terram⁸⁹ israel,^{DD}

= ob merita obsequiorum suorum providetur ut homini coniun-

= geretur ex abrahamae stirpe venienti.⁹⁰ Et primum quidem

= huic quem ipsa propinquum magis esse credebat qui negat

= se posse illi⁹¹ nubere. Et recedente illo per testimonium

= decem maiorum booz illi coniungitur, et ab ipsis decem

= senioribus benedicitur. ==

= Quod⁹² prius ille cognatus confitetur se eidem nubere

= non posse, hoc loco iohannis baptistae figuram ostendere⁹³

= estimatur,⁹⁴ quia⁹⁵ cum ipse a populo israel christus

= putaretur et interrogaretur quis esset non negavit sed

= confessus est dicens christum se non esse et perseverantibus

= his qui missi erant⁹⁶ et inquirentibus quis esset respondit,

= Ego sum vox clamantis in deserto,⁹⁷ ^{EE} novissime confitetur

= de domino ipse⁹⁸ dicens, Qui habet sponsam sponsus est.

= Se autem amicum sponsi manifestat cum adiecit, Amicus autem

88. vestigiiis - M

89. in terra - M

90. veniente - N

91. illi omitted by M

92. ga = quia? - N; qui - S; sed quod - Isidore

93. ostendi - Isidore

94. estimamus - N and S

95. qui - Isidore

96. fuerant - M

97. et added by Isidore

98. ipse de domino - Isidore

== end of Chapter 3

DD Cf. Ruth I, 22

EE John I, 23

= sponsi est qui stat et audit eum et laetatur propter
 = vocem sponsi.^{FF} ===
 = Hunc ergo estimant⁹⁹ quia christum in die visitationis
 = suae venisse non intelligebant esse ecclesiae sponsum qui
 = propheticis esset vocibus ante promissus. Sed sicut ille
 = propinquus propinquum se esse¹⁰⁰ negavit et postea ruth
 = iungitur booz, ita christus qui vere sponsus ecclesiae est
 = quem omnium prophetarum oracula cecinerant dignatus est
 = ecclesiam assumere et¹⁰¹ ex omnibus gentibus per totum orbem
 = terrarum deo patri innumeros¹⁰² populos offerre.===
 = Quod exalciat¹⁰³ se cognatus ille veterum consuetudo
 = erat^{GG} ut si sponsus sponsam¹⁰⁴ repudiare vellet disalciatur
 = ille et hoc esset signum repudii. Proinde exalciare¹⁰⁵
 = iubetur ne ad ecclesiam quasi sponsus calciatus accederet.
 = Hoc enim christo servabatur¹⁰⁶ qui verus sponsus erat.¹⁰⁷

99. ergo christum existimabant - Isidore

100. propinquum se esse omitted by Isidore

101. et omitted by N and S

102. patri ex innumeros - M

103. quod vero exalciat - Isidore

104. sponsam sponsus - N and S; sponsa sponsum - Isidore

105. exalciari - Isidore

106. servabat - S

107. sponsus erat verus - Isidore

FF John IV, 20

GG Cf. Ruth IV, 7

=== end of Chapter 4

==+ end of Chapter 5

= Decem autem maiorum natu benedictio^{HH} hoc ostendit in nomine
 = ihesu¹⁰⁸ omnes esse gentes¹⁰⁹ salvandas ac benedicendas.==+=
 = Iota enim apud grecos decem significat quae prima
 = littera nomen domini ihesu summa¹¹⁰ prescribit. Quae res ut
 = diximus omnes gentes per ipsum salvandas ac benedicendas
 = esse¹¹¹ demonstrat. Nec dubitet¹¹² ergo quisquam haec ut
 = dicta sunt credere cum videat universa et ab initio figuris
 = antecedentibus precurrisse¹¹³ et per adventum domini
 = manifeste¹¹⁴ adimpleta sic esse, et quae supersunt hoc modo
 = perficienda in veritate¹¹⁵ consonantibus omnibus et vocibus
 = et figuris sanctarum scripturarum¹¹⁶ impletisque¹¹⁷ quae
 = pollicitus est per ihesum christum dominum regem et
 = salvatorem nostrum cum quo est illi honor et gloria in
 = saecula saeculorum, amen. ==

(Explicit expositio Claudii Episcopi in libro Ruth)¹¹⁸

108. nomine domini ihesu - Isidore

109. omnes gentes esse - Isidore

110. summam - Isidore

111. salvandas esse (i.e. omits ac benedicendas) - Isidore

112. ne dubitet - N and S

113. precucurrisse - S and Isidore

114. manifesta et - N; manifeste et - S

115. virtute - M

116. quae added by N and S

117. implevit - N; impletis - S

118. Explicit in S only.

==+= end of Chapter 6

== end of Chapter 7

HH Cf. Ruth IV, 11-12

TRANSLATION

The beginning of the exposition of the book of Ruth by
Bishop Claudius.

And it came to pass in the days of one of the judges that famine occurred in the land, and a man went out from Bethlehem of Judah to sojourn in the land of Moab, he and his wife and his two sons. And the name of the man was Elimelech; and the name of his wife was Noemi; and the names of his two sons Maallon and Chelleon; they were Ephratites. They set out from Bethlehem-Judah and came to the land of Moab and dwelt there. Elimelech, the husband of Noemi, died and she and her two sons were left. They married Moabite wives. The name of the first was Orpha and the second Ruth. They remained there about ten years and both her sons, Maallon and Chelleon, died.

The famine which Scripture says happened among the people of Israel is to be understood as a famine of the Divine Word which, because of the sin of all the people, was being delivered very seldom by the prophets - as it is written, the word of the Lord was very precious. Since all had turned aside no one could be found to whom the Word of God might be given. For that reason the narrative does not point out the name of the Judge that there was at that time. Since all the people were living without a governor, each man dared to do what he wished.

The man Elimelech, whose name is interpreted as "God is King", portrayed a figure of the law of Moses through which God

is known to be the creator and ruler of all things, that is,
both visible and invisible. Noemi, which is interpreted
Beautiful, presented a type of the Synagogue which was called
 beautiful because of the worship and knowledge of God. Also
 the two sons of these, that is, sons of Law and Synagogue,
 are recognised to have been the two nations, Israel and Judah;

Who because there was a famine of the Divine Word -
 because, as the prophet said, Their priests teach for money
and their prophets tell the future for gifts;

Leaving Bethlehem, which is interpreted the house of
bread, i.e. the house of him who bore testimony that he came
 down from heaven to feed the minds of believers and who, as he
 says himself, grants life eternal to those who feed on him;

They went over to a strange, foreign and profane worship.
 While they lingered in this evil delusion, it is written that
 in a little while the husband of Synagogue, who was Law, as we
 said, died. The divine Law of course not only is exiled but
 also dies for the transgressors, i.e. those who turn away from
 the worship of God. For it becomes an exile to those who
 hand it over to scorn by being slaves to all vices while it
 dies for those who exert themselves to present to devils the
reverent worship which is owed to God the creator alone.

Therefore it is written that when the Law was dead to trans-
 gressors, the Synagogue remained a widow with her two peoples.
 God had declared through a prophet that he had sent away
 their mother Synagogue on account of their sins. Therefore
casting off the yoke of the Law from their necks and becoming
 the sons of Belial, they have joined in foreign superstitions,

in the error of idolatry and the pleasures of this present life, in which, making use of their sacrilegious liberty, they miserably lost the life that was granted to them by the Lord. For these reasons we read that God upbraided them through a prophet. He said, They have abandoned me, the fountain of living water and have dug for themselves cisterns that are not able to hold water.

Noemi, who represented the Synagogue, and whose name, as we said, meant beautiful, after the death of her husband, the sacred Law, was left as a widow and also left childless by the death of both nations as an expiation for sin. After the tenth year of her exile was over, learning that God had looked with compassion on his people, sending them his Son who deigned to be born in Bethlehem, her city, accepting human flesh through a virgin, She arose so that she might return from the land of Moab to her native land with both her daughters in law. She arose because of her repentance, which previously had been dormant because of her sinful transgression; she abandoned the idolatrous worship by sinking down into which she had been widowed and made childless and she hastened to return to the former country which she had left, reverence for the worship of God, so to speak, by means of those of the Jews who had believed, even the blessed apostles about whom we read that the prophet has proclaimed, How beautiful are the feet of those who preach peace, who preach good news. When she was already on her way and eager to return to the land of Judah, i.e. to confession of our Lord Jesus Christ, She said to both her daughters in law, Go to your mothers' houses and may the

Lord have pity on you. And may the Lord grant to you to find rest in the houses of the husbands that you may receive.

Lifting up their voices, they began to weep, , , and Orpha kissed her mother in law and went back to her people and to her Gods at once.

However Ruth, a type of the Church, conceiving a desire for worship of God, and, as the Psalmist sang, Forgetting the home of her people and of her father, held on to her mother in law and said, Do not turn away from me that I should leave you and go away. For where you go, I will go. Where you stay, I will stay. Your people will be my people and your God my God. I will die in the land that receives your dead body, and there I will accept the place of my burial.

= In this way the Church has been called to the Lord
 = from the Gentiles, leaving her own country which is idolatry
 = and abandoning all earthly associations. She declares
 = that the Lord is her God, the Lord in whom the saints have
 = believed and that she will follow Christ to the place where
 = his earthly body ascended after his Passion and that she
 = suffers in this present age as far as death for his name
 = and that she must have fellowship with the people of the
 = saints, that is the patriarchs and the prophets. Concerning
 = her union with these, that she is to be united with the
 = saints who come of the stock of Abraham, Moses in a song
 = showed it when he said, Rejoice you Gentiles with all His
 = people, i.e. those of you of the Gentiles who will have
 = believed, rejoice with everlasting joy together with those
 = who were chosen first. ==

However people also among all the Gentiles who have remained behind, being slaves of the ancient errors and pleasures of idolatry are understood to be in the type of Orpha. So it is not unjustly that the name Ruth is interpreted as seeing or deciding or hastening. She saw with inward vision that, as it is written, the images of demons are vanity of vanities and that the Lord of heaven is the creator and governor of all creation, and, determining in her heart that nothing can be placed higher than love of him, abandoning all delay, she hastened to hurry to join in worship of him. It is for this reason that she was properly known afterwards as the wife of "virtue". The fame of both the women, the mother in law, as it were, for those of the Jews who had believed, as we mentioned earlier, and the daughter in law for those who came as converts from the Gentiles, grew swiftly among all the citizens that is, the inhabitants of all the earth.

When the women said, "This woman is Noemi", we read that she replied, "Do not call me Noemi (that is 'Beautiful') but", she said, "Call me Mara (that is 'Bitter'). Since in truth the Almighty has filled me with bitterness." This humble reply is aptly applied to the role of penitents. For as long as a person holds unbroken his faith in the Trinity, he possesses the grace of beauty granted him by God. If by failure he loses it and afterwards tries hard to return to his original state of Grace, he must show bitterness of soul by way of penitence since no one can achieve a cure to obtain good health unless he puts up with the tortures of the drugs first.

And Noemi returned, and with her Ruth the Moabite
her daughter in law, who returned from the land of Moab.
They returned at the beginning of the barley harvest. For
 even at that time the church is recognised to come from the
 Gentiles to faith in Christ the Lord when those who obeyed
 the Old Testament are said to have received faith in Christ
 through the Apostles. The Evangelist relates that it was
 said to them by the Lord, Lift up your eyes and see; because
the fields are already white for the harvest, indicating of
 course the crowds of believers.

Then Ruth the Moabite said to Noemi, "I will go now
to the field so that I may gather ears of corn after the
reapers of whatever man in whose sight I may find favour".
So Noemi said to her, "Go, my daughter". She went out and
came and gleaned after the reapers". Ruth is discovered to
 be a figure for the Gentile church by general opinion
 desiring to search for a livelihood by the work of her hands,
 that is, to obtain eternal life by works of piety. For she
 did not dare to associate as a son would with those of the
 Jews who believed, but following from afar the footprints
 of the apostles, she was zealous to hear with anxious thought
 what issued from their mouths.

Now it happened that, The Bible says, That field was
owned by a man called Booz, who was of the family of Elimelech,
and that man was powerful and the owner of great wealth. For
 Booz, whose name is interpreted Force or in whom lies power
 represents our Lord, who, the Psalmist says, was the Lord
strong and mighty in the battle of the Passion and he calls

him the Lord of Power. Also Paul the Apostle has declared that He is the wisdom and power of God. What Scripture says - that he was of the family of Elimelech, whose name, as we said above, is to be interpreted as God is King - is to be referred to that Word which assumed human form, that is, the Son of God. Scripture foretells in many places that he is Lord and King.

So Ruth gleaned; beating with a stick and threshing what she had gathered, she found almost an ephah of barley in amount, that is, three measures. She took it up and went back to the city and showed it to her mother in law and she also brought out and gave her of the remains of her food from which she had eaten enough. And her mother in law said to her, "Where did you glean today?" And she told her where she had worked and what Booz had commanded her; that she should be with his reapers until all the crops were harvested. Noemi answered her, "May he be blessed by the Lord because he has kept the same graciousness to the dead that he showed to the living. The man is a close relative of ours", she said also. So Ruth joined the maidservants of Booz, and she harvested with them until the barley and wheat were gathered into the barn.

For indeed the church comes from the Gentiles to faith in Christ and holds to the preachers of His word and also to those things which were done by them in the power of the Spirit, listening very attentively as though now made a catechumen and also refreshed by their food and drink, that is, by the good advice in their sermons. Turning over in the "rigour" of her mind what she had received by hearing she

discovered that the blessed Trinity was of one divinity and one substance. The Passion compelled and commended the preaching of the Gospel which she had heard from the Apostles to her faith and her remembrance.

She hastened to her mother in law; that is, to the customs and example of the patriarchs and prophets from whose lineage that woman was descended as she wished zealously to learn.

Until they had gathered in the barley and wheat harvests, that is, until she had learned the mystery of the Old and New Testaments, she followed without wavering the tracks of the Apostles.

= So Ruth entered the land of Israel with her mother in
 = law. It was arranged that because of the merits of her
 = obedience she should marry a man issuing from stock of
 = Abraham. She thought at first that she must marry the man
 = who was a closer relative; he said that he could not marry
 = her. When he withdrew, with ten elders as witnesses, Booz
 = married her, and she was blessed by the same ten elders.

= The story of that first relative who said that he was
 = not able to marry her is considered to represent John the
 = Baptist in this passage. For when he was thought to be the
 = Christ by the people of Israel and was asked who he was, he
 = did not deny but assert that he was not the Christ; and
 = when those who had been sent persisted and asked who he was
 = he replied, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.
 = He himself finally confessed about the Lord, saying, The one
 = who has the bride is the bridegroom. He showed that he was

= the friend of the bridegroom when he added, The friend of
 = the bridegroom is the one who stands and hears and rejoices
 = at the voice of the bridegroom. Therefore because they did
 = not realise that Christ had come in the day of his
 = visitation, they regard as the bridegroom of the Church
 = this one who was promised in advance by the voices of the
 = prophets.

= But just as that relative said that he was not a
 = relative and then Ruth married Booz, so Christ, who is the
 = true bridegroom of the church whom all the prophets foretold,
 = deigned to take the church as bride, and to present to God
 = the Father unnumbered peoples from all the nations of the
 = whole world.

= Why did that relative take off his sandal? It was the
 = custom of the ancients that if a bridegroom wished to break
 = off his engagement with his bride, he took off his sandal
 = and this was the sign of the breaking off of the engagement.
 = So he was commanded to take off his sandal so that he should
 = not approach the church sandalled like a bridegroom. For
 = this was reserved for Christ who was the true bridegroom.
 = Also the blessing by the ten (aged) elders shows that in the
 = name of Christ all the nations are to be saved and blessed.

= For to the Greeks the letter iota signifies ten and
 = this initial letter summarily depicts the name of the Lord
 = Jesus. This argument shows, as we said, that all nations are
 = to be saved and blessed through him. And no one should
 = hesitate to believe that this is as has been said when he
 = can see that everything both from the beginning has been

=prefigured by previous signs and also has been clearly
=fulfilled in the coming of the Lord. Also the things that
=remain are to be truly completed in this way since all the
=words and metaphors of the Holy Scriptures are in agreement,
=and when there is fulfilled what He promised through His son, cap
=Jesus Christ, our Lord and King and Saviour to whom with him
=be honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen.

The Completion of the exposition by Bishop Claudius
on the book of Ruth.

The Old Latin Text of the Book of Ruth

In the Carolingian period there must still have been a number of manuscripts which contained a relatively pure text of the Old Latin versions of the Bible, as well as many manuscripts of the Hieronymian Version which had been contaminated by Old Latin readings. At Lyons were to be found some of the most interesting of the Old Latin manuscripts including the Codex Bezae. If we may judge from the commentary on Samuel and Kings, Claudius was very interested in textual variants and recorded some unusual readings.

He was well aware that there were considerable differences between the Old Latin and the Vulgate. Following the practice of Bede,¹ he called these two texts the Septuaginta and the Hebraica (veritas)² respectively. He considered that the Hebraica was to be preferred, at least in the calculation of computistical data. Jerome had said, "In Veteri Testamento, si quando inter Graecos Latinosque diversitas est, ad Hebraicam confugimus veritatem; ut quidquid de fonte proficiscitur, hoc quaeramus in rivulis".³

When an edition of the Old Latin text of the Book of Ruth is prepared note ought to be taken of three passages in the commentary on Ruth by Claudius. These contain the text of Ruth I, 1-5; I, 22 and II, 2-3. The version of the text given by Claudius in these three passages from Ruth and

1. Cf. MGH, A.A., XIII, 247.

2. Cf. MPL CIV, 811, 821, 824-5.

3. Epistola CVI, ad Sunaim et Fretellam, 2; C.S.E.L. LV, 2, 249.

these alone is very different from the Vulgate text and can best be explained as a very literal translation of the Greek text of the Book, i.e. the Septuaginta, into Latin. As far as possible one Latin word is given for one Greek word. The result is a very stilted Latin style.

The Old Latin versions of the Bible, i.e. those which circulated throughout the Latin-speaking churches before the revision by Jerome, were translations of that type. They were excessively literal and made no concessions to standards of literary Latin. After the new translations by Jerome had overcome an initial hostility they gradually replaced the Old Latin versions. Thus the sources for our knowledge of the Old Latin texts of the Bible are confined to a few manuscripts, most of which were copied in out of the way places, some readings retained in manuscripts which contain a mainly Vulgate text, and quotations from the Church Fathers.

By the time of Claudius the Old Latin texts had almost disappeared. Hrabanus never to my knowledge quoted from any version of the Bible other than the Vulgate. Claudius normally drew biblical quotations in his commentaries from the Vulgate, although he did display a knowledge of other versions and occasionally quoted from them.

There are two main sources for the Old Latin texts of the Book of Ruth. One of these is a manuscript, the Bible of Alcalá.⁴ In it are to be found two versions of the Book of Ruth. In its proper place in the list of the Books of the Old Testament comes an Old Latin version of the text.

4. Madrid, Universita centrale, Ms. Complutensis 31.

Then at the end of the manuscript is the Vulgate text. As the text of other Books is the Vulgate, it would appear that the Old Latin version was copied into the manuscript by mistake.

When I wrote to the University Library of Madrid to ask for a photocopy of the text I was informed that the manuscript was badly damaged in the fighting during the Spanish Civil War and that it was now illegible. Fortunately I remembered at a later date that the Abbazia di San Girolamo at Rome holds a stock of microfilms of many biblical manuscripts and, through the kindness of the librarian, M.A. Thibaut, I obtained a copy of the appropriate pages. Recently the *Vetus Latina Hispana* of the Octateuch which also makes use of the photographic copy preserved at Rome has appeared.⁵ The Old Latin text of the three passages as given by the Bible of Alcalá is provided here and may be compared with the passages in the text of the commentary on Ruth.

Claudius

Et factum est in diebus
unius iudicis facta est
fames in terra et abiit
vir a bethleem Iudeae ut
moraretur in agro moab,
ipse et uxor ipsius et duo
filii ipsius; et nomen erat
viro elimelech; et nomen erat

Bible of Alcalá

Factum est in diebus iudicis
iudicum facta est famis in terra
et habiit
vir ex bethlem iude ut
moraretur in agro moab
ipse et uxor eius et duo
filii eius. et nomen erat
viro illi elimelech et nomen

5. ed. T. Ayuso Marazuela, Vetus Latina Hispana II
Octateucho, 308-25.

Claudius

Bible of Alcalá

uxoris noemi; et nomen erat
duobus filiis eius maallon et
chelleon ephratei. Et
profecti

sunt ex bethleem iudeae et
venerunt in agro moab et
erant ibi.

Et mortuus est elimelech vir
noemi et relictæ est ipsa et
duo filii eius et acceperunt
sibi uxores moabitidas.

Unius nomen orpha et
secundæ

ruth. Et morati sunt ibi
quasi decem annis et mortui
sunt ambo filii eius maallon
et chelleon.

Ruth I, 1-5

Et reversa est noemi et
ruth moabitis nurus eius
cum illa quæ reversa est
de agro moab. Hæc autem
reversæ sunt initio messis
ordeariæ.

Ruth I, 22

Dixit autem ruth moabitis ad
noemi. Ibo nunc in agrum ut
colligam spicas de post
metentes

uxoris eius erat noemi. et nomina
duobus filiis eius Maallon et
alter celion ephratei.

qui erant ex bethlem iude et
venerunt in agro moab et
erant ibi.

et mortuus est elimelech vir eius
et relictæ est ipse et duo
filii eius. Et acceperunt
sibi uxores moabitidas.

nomen erat uni orfa et nomen
alteri

ruth. et morata est ibi
quasi decem annis et mortui
sunt ambo filii eius videlicet
maallon et celion. (f 80v)

Et reversa est noemi et
ruth moabitudis nurus eius
cum ea quæ reversa est
ex agro moab. hæc autem
advenerunt ad bethlem initio
mensis ordiarie. (f. 80v)

dixitque ruth moabitudis ad
noemi, Ibo nunc in agro et
colligam spicas de post

Claudius

cuiuscumque si invenero
 gratiam ante oculos eius
 Dixit autem ad illam noemi.
 Vade filia. Et abiit et
 veniens collegit in agro
 de post metentes.

Bible of Alcalá

cuiuscumque invenero
 gratiam ante oculos eius.
 dixit autem ei.
 Vade filia. Et habiit et
 veniens collegit in agro
 de post messorum. (f. 80v)

Ruth II, 2-3.

There is another witness to the text of the first passage in Claudius' commentary. It is a section of Ambrose's commentary on Luke.⁶ Sabatier in his edition of Old Latin texts⁷ printed the biblical text as a continuous whole. However in the commentary itself Ambrose cited the passage in very short sections which are never longer than two or three words. Therefore it is not possible to say that Ambrose was in every case quoting directly from a manuscript before him.

Ambrose's text however does bear a close resemblance to that of Claudius' commentary and that of the Bible of Alcalá. Where the Vulgate uses "homo", Claudius and Ambrose both use "vir", as does the Bible of Alcalá. All three witnesses agree in the use of "in agro moab" instead of the Vulgate "in regione moabitidae". Ambrose has "Elimelech viro nomen", the same construction as the other two witnesses to the Old

6. Exp. Ev. sec. Lucam III, 30-4 in C.C. XIV, 91-5.

7. P. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquiores I, 469.

Latin, where the Vulgate has "ipse vocabitur Elimelech". In verse 4 Claudius and Ambrose both say, "nomen uni Orpha et nomen secundae Ruth", where the Vulgate uses the "vocabitur" construction. Both Vulgate and Bible of Alcalá use "alter" for the earlier "secundus" of Claudius and Ambrose. Where the Vulgate says "decem annis", the other three texts use "quasi decem annis" which corresponds to the Greek "ὡς δέκα ἔτη". Claudius and the Bible of Alcalá use "morari" where Ambrose has "inhabitare" and the Vulgate "peregrinari". Billen⁸ in his study of the Old Latin texts notes that "morari" is used frequently by one manuscript, "Lugdunensis",⁹ instead of the more usual "habitare" or "inhabitare" of other Old Latin sources.

The use of "ipse" as a simple personal pronoun is also characteristic of the Old Latin. "Ipsius" is found twice in Claudius' version of the first passage where Ambrose and the Bible of Alcalá have "eius". As Billen shows,¹⁰ "ipse" and "is" are used in different parts of Old Latin manuscripts with different frequencies. In Lugdunensis "is" is almost always used in Leviticus, while "ipse" is remarkably common in the last two chapters of Genesis and part of Deuteronomy.

It may be said therefore that the text of Claudius' version of the first passage contains many features of a typical Old Latin text, and that it bears a close resemblance

8. A.V. Billen, Old Latin texts of the Heptateuch, 15.

9. Lyons, Bibl. Munic. 403 (329) + 1964 (1840).

10. op.cit., 141-2.

to the forms contained in the quotations from Ambrose and in the Bible of Alcalá, without being copied from either of these. Claudius was aware of the Vulgate text of the passage as can be seen from the brief reference in the commentary, "in regione videlicet moabitidae".

The correspondences between the versions of the second passage in Claudius' commentary and the Bible of Alcalá show that Claudius was also copying from an Old Latin text at that point. The use of "illa" for "ea" in Claudius' commentary cannot be taken as a sign of an earlier text, as Billen notes,¹¹ since both forms are found in early and late texts of the Old Latin. "Reversae sunt" for "advenerunt ad Bethlem" may represent a different manuscript tradition or may be a modification in the interests of clarity by Claudius himself or by the source from which he copied that part of the commentary.

In the third passage there are no witnesses to the Old Latin other than the Bible of Alcalá and Claudius' commentary. Once again Claudius' version is very like that in the Bible of Alcalá, but by no means identical. The Old Latin text contains a number of readings which can only be understood as very literal translations from Greek into Latin. "Dixit... ruth ... ad noemi" is an attempt to translate the preposition in "εἶπεν Ρουθ... πρὸς Νωεμὶν ". "De post metentes" must be an attempt to make sense of "κατὰ πῖσθεν ", although Billen¹² notes that compound prepositions are more common in the later

11. op.cit., 141.

12. op.cit., 154.

Old Latin texts than in the earlier ones. "Veniens collegit" again corresponds with the Greek grammatical construction. "Ante oculos" is a translation of the Greek "ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς", but the Vulgate "in conspectu" gives the correct sense of the words.

The quotations from other parts of the Bible that are given at the beginning of Claudius' commentary on Ruth are also taken from Old Latin versions of the Bible. These are from I Samuel III, 1, Judges XXI, 24 and Micah III, 11. A passage from Jeremiah II, 13 uses "lacus" where the Vulgate has "cisternas".

There are three possible explanations for the finding of so many uncommon readings in the commentary by Claudius. Claudius might have been able to read Greek and make his own independent translations from the Septuagint. This is unlikely because of the similarities of the text given to the Bible of Alcalá, and other Old Latin sources, and because he shows no signs of a knowledge of Greek in other works.

A second possible explanation is that he had access to an Old Latin manuscript of the Book of Ruth, containing a text similar to that of the Bible of Alcalá. This theory is attractive, since we know that Claudius possessed at least two texts of the Old Latin versions of Samuel and Kings.¹³

The third explanation, which I find most probable, is that Claudius copied parts of his commentary, including the text of the three passages in the Old Latin, from an earlier commentary, which I conjecture to be either the lost

13. Cf. MPL CIV, 824.

commentary by Bellator or the translation of a homily by Origen.

The quotation of another version of the Bible from that with which he was familiar would be in accordance with the practice of Claudius, who quoted from earlier sources with scrupulous care, making as few alterations as were necessary. It may be that almost the whole of the commentary except the passages taken from Isidore's Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum should be attributed to that earlier source.

Conclusion

The purpose of a commentary might be defined as the setting of a work in its true context, the explication of its meaning and the explanation of any particular difficulties of grammar, language and thought. Scholars of the early middle ages would have added to these that a commentary must also increase the piety of its readers. In a world where death and hell were near at hand there was little time to be spared for purely intellectual pursuits.

Claudius in his commentary on Ruth concentrated his attention on the meaning and purpose of the book. He made explicit the interpretation of Ruth as the type or example of the Gentile who is accepted into Israel and given a place of honour in the plan of God. Since the author of the Book of Ruth held universalistic beliefs similar to those proclaimed by Jesus, it is not unjust to see Ruth as a forerunner of the Gentile Church.

The weaknesses of the commentary are those of the age in which it was written. There was little background information available. The allegories used by Claudius were based on the best etymologies that were available, those written by Jerome. They add a new dimension to the old story of the alien who was accepted into God's own people, but do not distort or obscure the story beyond all recognition. The allegories may be seen as either survivals of an earlier writer's attempt to come to grips with the meaning of the story, or, less probably, as the application of Claudius' knowledge of the rules of allegory to a Book of the Bible which had not

previously been dealt with fully.

However allegory is not the only mode of interpretation to be found in the commentary. In a manner more reminiscent of the sermon than the commentary, the author has placed alongside texts from the Book of Ruth passages from other parts of the Bible. The results are always interesting and sometimes profound. The paragraph about Boaz has a ring of eloquence about it that is contrasted sharply with the limping style of the opening paragraphs of the commentary.

The commentary has few merits as a literary work. Its style is awkward and diffuse. There is much repetition and poverty of expression. However it is of interest because it is the earliest surviving commentary on the whole of the Book of Ruth and because it has preserved several passages from Old Latin texts. It may contain parts of a lost patristic work, such as a homily by Origen or the commentary on Ruth by Bellator.

Chapter Eight

Although medieval biblical commentaries are not likely to become popular in the modern world, any work which is highly praised by contemporaries and which continues to be copied for more than five hundred years cannot be completely dismissed. If one is to appreciate the virtues of Claudius' commentary on Ruth, Samuel and Kings, one must try to enter into the situation in which it was written. In the Carolingian period there was an air of optimism as the darkness and ignorance of past ages was being pushed away. A well ordered and moderately rich civilisation had been established. Scholars had both leisure and materials to collect together the wisdom of the ancient world and teach it to later generations. Since schools flourished, textbooks for both elementary and higher fields of learning were required.

It is within this programme of education that Claudius' commentary must be placed. When Leidrad wrote of the schools at Lyons to his patron Charlemagne, "I have schools for readers where they have practice not only in the correct reading of the lessons of the Office but also in arriving at the spiritual sense by study of the Holy Scriptures,"¹ he was referring to the educational system that produced Claudius and for which the commentary was written.

The commentary consists of a selection of patristic exegesis for teaching about these five books of the Bible.

1. See note 3 in Ch. 3.

It may be compared with the homiliaries of the period, which are arrangements of patristic exegesis for liturgical purposes. Therefore there is nothing truly original about Claudius' commentary. Claudius would no more have thought of being original in his commentary than a modern scholar would think it right to invent a medieval source and offer it as evidence. Claudius wished to make the true teaching of the Church, as revealed in the writings of the Fathers, available to his own generation in a convenient form.

Since Claudius' work was closely followed by another two commentaries on the same books it is worthwhile to compare them. Each of the Carolingian commentaries may fitly be described as a catena of patristic exegesis. The Glossa Ordinaria is a distillation of the works of the Fathers. The Carolingian commentaries are merely collections.

The commentary on Samuel and Kings by Angelomus was based on the works of Bede and the commentary by Hrabanus and therefore is of little interest.² Claudius and Hrabanus worked independently of each other, searching through the works of the Fathers for suitable material. The major sources were used by both, i.e. Augustine's de Civitate Dei, Jerome, Gregory-Paterius, Isidore and Bede. Hrabanus used the works of Jerome more extensively than Claudius and also excerpted the commentary by a Jew of "modern times".³ Claudius found a much wider range of sources, including homilies by

2. M.L.W. Laistner, The Intellectual Heritage of the Middle Ages, 191-194.

3. MPL XXIII, 1391-1470.

Origen, Pseudo-Chrysostom, "Eusebius Gallicanus", and Caesarius of Arles. He also made use of several works of Augustine not found in Hrabanus' commentary.

While Hrabanus rewrote his sources to some extent, he did ^{so} less and less as the commentary progressed. Claudius from the first pages of his commentary made as few changes as possible. He sacrificed unity of style to accuracy of quotation. The same desire to be true to his sources is found in the passage on the witch of En Dor. Where Hrabanus followed Isidore in quoting a truncated form of the quaestio from Augustine's ad Simplicianum, Claudius returned to the original and quoted it in full.⁴

Comparison with Hrabanus' commentary also reveals certain characteristics special to Claudius' treatises. Although both commentaries consist almost entirely of allegorical interpretations, Claudius' commentary contains several notes about textual questions, and a number of passages quoted from different manuscripts of the Bible. Even these few verses are a considerable addition to the stock of information about the Old Latin versions of Ruth, Samuel and Kings. It does not seem to me that Claudius deserves his reputation as being less interested in literal interpretation of the Bible than Hrabanus.⁵ Claudius said in the commentary on Galatians, "Dedit regulam Apostolus quomodo allegorizzare debemus: scilicet ut manente veritate

4. MPL CIX, 67-69; Cf. MPL CIV, 684-687.

5. Cf. M.L.W. Laistner, Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A D 500-900, 303.

historiae, figuras intelligamus".⁶

Claudius' personal view on two matters seem to have intruded themselves into the commentary. In the appendix there is an excursus in which Claudius expounded his beliefs about images.⁷ Part of a sermon by Caesarius was altered from a general condemnation of greed and self-seeking to a specific attack on priests who sell for money the ministerial gift that had been handed freely to them.⁸ The same theme is repeated briefly in the commentary on Ruth where Claudius said that the Word of the Lord had been "precious" because priests were taking money to perform their functions.⁹ It was perhaps easier for the celibate, ascetic scholar-bishop to condemn the practice than to root out the desire on the lower ranks of the clergy that they should receive some reward for their services.

If one attempts an assessment of the commentary by the standards of its own period, one can point to three main qualities. There is a wide and varied use of the most popular form of interpretation, i.e. allegory. There are many sources, although there is no evidence that Claudius labelled them in the way that he identified the sources of the commentary on Matthew. The work is also rigidly orthodox, based as it is on the exegesis of the Fathers. The one question of unorthodoxy was raised by the editor,

6. MPL CIV, 888.

7. ibid., 825-827.

8. ibid., 778-779 quoting sermo XXIX, 1.

9. See Ch. 7.

J. Trombelli, when he encountered the phrase Dominicus homo.¹⁰ However Trombelli pointed out that similar phrases are to be found in the works of the Fathers before Nestorius.

To a Christian of today the works of the Fathers are of interest, and may on occasions be of value. They are not normative for one's faith as they were for Claudius and his contemporaries. While their interpretations might be quoted, the Fathers are only one of many sources that are drawn upon for a modern commentary on the Bible. On many matters our information is far more full and accurate than that possessed by any of the Fathers. Therefore Claudius' commentary is of little more than historical interest.

E. Comba suggested eighty years ago that the Roman Catholic authorities had discouraged the publication of Claudius' commentaries since they feared their doctrinal emphasis.¹¹ Given the religious and political situation in Italy in the nineteenth century this is not as unreasonable as it may seem. No such considerations would deter a modern editor from publishing them.

It may be that there are fragments of earlier lost works within the commentary by Claudius, by Origen, Augustine or Bellator. The accurate quotation of sources might have seemed a defect to earlier ages. Modern scholars will be glad to gain a witness to the texts of these and other works available to Claudius at the beginning of the ninth century.

10. ibid., 738.

11. Claudio di Torino, 44.

One's quarrel with Claudius is not that he dressed up his sources in a spurious latinity, but that one would like to be certain that he was quoting exactly from e.g. the manuscripts of the Old Latin version of the Bible.

The part of the commentary that exercised Claudius' creative genius most was the appendix. To reply to Theutmir's questions Claudius searched out a wide variety of information. Even there one finds little that is original.

Claudius may claim the distinction of being, as far as he knew, the first person to compose a full-length commentary on the books of Ruth, Samuel and Kings. The commentaries on I Samuel by Gregory and Bede were almost certainly unknown to Claudius. Claudius was a pioneer in dealing with those books which were the "more ancient and more difficult to understand of all the books of the divine Law, and which lacked a great interpreter".¹² Others followed his example and produced more popular works on the same basic plan. They take their place in the history of education and of exegesis among those who transmitted the heritage of the Ancient World to medieval Europe.

In my study of Claudius' commentary I have tried to show something of the work that Claudius put into the composition of the commentary. J. Trombelli edited the commentary in an admirably thorough and careful way. I have been able to add a few more sources to the long list discovered by him. The result has been to show how little Claudius

12. MGH EpKA II, 607.

wrote himself and how large his library was.

I hope that I have been able to dispose of the attribution of the Pseudo-Eucherian commentary on Samuel and Kings to anyone other than to Claudius. In Appendix Three I have dealt with the recent conjectures by P. Capelle and A. Hamman. The attribution of the acephalous version of the commentary to Eucherius or to Angelomus is the conjecture of a medieval scribe. The evidence of manuscripts and printed editions shows that there is no difference between the two versions other than omissions from certain manuscripts.

Appendix One

A Brevis Chronica of "Claudius Chronologus" is to be found among the works of Claudius of Turin in Migne's Patrologia Latina.¹ Although the only edition, from which Migne reprinted the treatise, was made from a defective manuscript, the general plan of the Chronica may be discerned.

The Chronica began with a summary of the events of Bible history from Adam to Christ following the Hebraica Veritas. Since that section has been lost, the start of the printed edition is a paragraph in which the author calculated the exact year and day of the creation of the world according to the sources available to him. Then the author explained why he preferred the numbers of years as given in the Hebrew Scriptures to those given in the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament. One does not need to assume from this that the author knew even a single word of either of these languages. The Old Latin versions of the Bible were translated from the Septuagint. Jerome turned to the Hebrew for his translation, the Vulgate as it has come to be called.

The main body of the Chronica was divided into five or six chapters. Each of these corresponded with one of the first five or six of the seven Ages into which early Christian historians divided the events of world history. The manuscript is defective from near the end of the fourth chapter until the beginning of the conclusion of the treatise.

1. MPL CIV, 917-26.

The part that is lost dealt therefore with the reigns of the last Kings of Judah, the Exile and the Inter-Testamental period, and, if there was an account of the events of the sixth Age, the events from the birth of Christ until the author's own day. I suggest that there was no sixth chapter since the author stated at the beginning of the treatise as it now exists that he was writing a work of biblical chronology.

The end of the concluding section has also been lost. However, if one may judge from the surviving portion, probably it is only a few lines that are lost. In the conclusion the three topics discussed are as follows.

The author made some calculations about the year in which he wrote the Chronica, A.D.814. We can be sure that he was correct since he described it as the year in which Charlemagne died and in which Louis the Pious became sole ruler of the Frankish Empire. The calculations, which show whether the year was a leap year or not and when the date of Easter was in that year, follow the rules which had been set out in a digression inserted into the third chapter of the Chronica.

The other two topics are a brief discussion of when the sixth Age will end and the seventh, the return of Christ, will begin, followed by another eulogy of the Hebrew text of the Bible. Here is found an exact quotation from Bede's Chronicle,² which says that the Septuagint, i.e. the Old Latin version, is inaccurate because, as many say, the translation

2. MGH A.A. XIII, 321.

was made in a careless manner, or, as Augustine says, because it was corrupted by the Gentiles, or because the text has been contaminated from other sources. The text of the Chronica breaks off at that point.

In the Chronica important events, such as the beginning of each Age of History, are given with great precision by both the Jewish and Roman systems of dating. Each event is linked typologically to the great events of Creation, Passover and Easter. For example Noah entered the Ark on the same day of the year on which Adam was created.

The chronology of the lives of the patriarchs is given in two forms, iuxta Septuaginta and iuxta Hebraicam veritatem. The author showed that the two chronologies add up to the same total, but, following Bede and his predecessor Jerome, undoubtedly considered the Hebrew version to be correct.³

P. Labbé, the first editor of the Chronica,⁴ mentioned two manuscripts of it. One of them had been in Paris and was probably the one used by Labbé for his edition since he described it as imperfecta licet et fine mutila.⁵ According to him the title of the treatise given in the manuscript was Claudius de sex Aetatibus. By the time Labbé came to write the Nova Bibliotheca the manuscript was no longer available to him since it had been purchased for the library of Queen

3. Cf. Bede in the Chronica, MGH A.A. XIII, 247; Jerome in Hebr. Quaest. in Gen. in C.C. LXXII, 8-9.

4. Nova Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum, 309f.

5. ibid., 3.

Christina of Sweden. No record of what happened to it after the purchase has survived, as the staff of the Kungliga Bibliotheket, Stockholm, have recently confirmed to me.

According to information supplied to P. Labbé by a correspondent there was a manuscript of Saints' Lives and Chronica at the friary of the Barefoot Carmelites at Clermont Ferrand, which included a Claudii chronicon.⁶ So far I have not been able to trace any reference to this manuscript in modern catalogues of manuscripts.

Who was "Claudius chronologus"? P. Labbé believed that he was Claudius of Turin. He said, "Certe et tempus et caetera omnia apprime consentiunt".⁷ Since Labbé's attribution the Chronica does not appear to have attracted much attention and it is not mentioned in most of the surveys of the relevant literature, e.g. A. Cordoliani, "Les Traités de comput du haut moyen âge (526-1003)" in Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin du Cange) XVII (1943), 51-72. The only mention of it I have traced in recent literature is to be found in Pour revaloriser Migne,⁸ where P. Glorieux has marked it as of doubtful authenticity, although no authority is given for the statement.

The Chronica was composed with the help of earlier treatises on computation. One source which was used extensively and can be identified without hesitation is the Chronicle attached by Bede to his de Temporum Ratione.⁹

6. ibid., 208.

7. De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis I, 228.

8. op.cit., 55.

9. Cf. MGH A.A. XIII, 249-50, 252, etc.

Most of the calculations and numbers given are identical with those in Bede. Parts of the introductory and closing sections are quoted exactly from Bede. The expression iuxta Hebraicam veritatem is probably drawn from the same source.¹⁰ However Bede was not the only source. The author either had access to a work of a markedly typological nature or, less probably, possessed a vivid imagination. The material provided was then worked upon by a mathematician of greater ability than was common in the Carolingian Age. This person, who was presumably the author, fused the typological material together with the mathematical data provided in Bede's computistical treatises in order to produce something genuinely original.

The following passages are examples of the material which is found in the Chronica and in no other composition that I have examined.

Igitur omnipotens Creator cum universum perfecisset mundi ornatum, tertia die post ornatum coeli condidit hominem, qui ornatus coeli, id est sol et luna, et stellae, ratione veridica in aequinoctio vernali inveniuntur primo esse creatae quod apud nos secundum dies solares XII Kal. Aprilis solemus nuncupare: et ita ratione deducta X Kal. Aprilis luna septima decima invenitur protoplastus Adam ex terrae limo esse formatus pariter atque animatus secundum hanc nostram supputationem. Secundus Adam Christus Dei Filius, Deus pariter atque homo, Deus ante saecula, homo in fine saeculorum, Deus de Deo, homo de homine, Deus de Patre sine initio et matre, homo a certo initio de matre sine homine patre eodem tempore, sed non eadem feria, id est X Kal. Aprilis invenitur resurrexisse a mortuis

Si quis forte minus Scripturarum divinarum studiis eruditus de hoc opere dubitare tentaverit, redeat ad divinos secundum Hebraicam veritatem scriptos libros, et quidquid ibidem invenerit, eos teneat et credat, meque damnare desistat.¹¹

10. Cf. ibid., 249, 252.

11. MPL CIV, 917d-918d.

Secunda saeculi aetate, prima huius die, quae est decima (viginti suggests C.W. Jones) septima dies mensis secundi, egressus est Noe de arca, uxor eius, et filii, et uxores filiorum eius, die prima feria, quam nos propter resurrectionem Domini Dominicam nuncupamus: quia, sicut supra iam dixi, si more nostro ipso tempore computarentur feriae vel Kalendae, essent ipso anno quo egressi sunt ex arca, Kalendae mensis Ianuarii, feria quinta anno primo post bissextum. et quia fuit annus quintus cycli solaris, qui est decemnovalis et quartus epactalis, XXII fuerunt in Epacta, et fuit VII Idus Martii mensis Neomenia, id est novae lunae principium. Et haec fuit secundum¹² Hebraeos primi mensis initium, et anni principium.

A possible source for the typological material is the Laterculus Imperatorum Romanorum Malalianus¹³ which is conjectured to have been written at Rome about the middle of the eighth century. Unfortunately the section of the Chronica dealing with the birth of Christ is lost, and therefore no direct comparisons can be made between the data contained in the two works. There is however a similarity in the way calculations have been made in both treatises. The preceding passages from the Chronica may be compared with the following extract from the Laterculus.

In mense Distro, id est secundum Latinos Martium, XXV die mensis, hoc est VIII kal Apriles, qui secundum Gregus Xanthicus appellatur, hora diurnam secunda initiante tertia, die dominica, missus est archangelus Gabrihel evangelizare beata Maria... .. VIII ergo kal. Aprilis, id est aequinoctium vernalem, conceptus est dominus in utero virginis. nam et eadem diem patibulum crucis ascendit et postea in sepulchro est positus.¹⁴

When however it is noted that the Laterculus dates the Crucifixion to the 8th day before the Calends of April,

12. ibid., 919d.

13. MGH A.A. XIII, 426-37. See A. Siegmund Die Ueberlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur, 172 for authorship and date.

14. ibid., 426.

i.e. March 25th, Claudius to the 12th day,¹⁵ and Bede to the 10th,¹⁶ another source is probably to be sought for.

In my quest for information about the Chronica I approached Prof. C.W. Jones who kindly wrote as follows:

I agree with you that the tastes of the author of the Brevis Chronica (a strange combination!) and the Commentary on Kings are sufficiently identical to suggest Claudius as the author of both, as he is of the Commentary on Genesis, which I once consulted in relation to Bede's Commentary on Genesis.

I have tested just some of the data of your passage and believe that all of it (except of course, the typographical errors, e.g. "decima septima mensis secundi" for "viginti septima..." - the Patrologia text has been carelessly transmitted) could have been derived by an astute author directly from Bede's formulas in DTR, etc., but it would take more calculation than was common among Carolingian authors, and I find myself believing that Claudius himself may be responsible for what is written. The typological drive of the Brevis, with its accent on like moon and feria for the opening of the several ages, is new to me, and comes from someone quite versed in calculation. It suggests inspiration from Julian of Toledo's De comprobatione sex. aet. The text of that which I have at hand is incomplete, and I have not been able to find a helpful similarity in it.

Nothing that Claudius says is inconsistent with Bede's calculations but he does extend them rationally.

Since the available edition of the works of Julian of Toledo is not complete I wrote to J. Hillgarth who is editing the works of Julian for the Corpus Christianorum to ask if he could find any link between the Chronica and these. He replied that there did not appear to be any connection.

In search of the typological source I also examined the Dies Dominica,¹⁷ a short work in praise of Sunday which

15. MPL CIV, 918.

16. MGH A.A. XIII, 249.

17. R.E. McNally, "Dies Dominica; two Hiberno-latin texts" in Medieval Studies XXII (1960), 355-361, with a summary by J. Daniélou in Settimane di Studio X (1963), 154-161.

enjoins strict Sunday observance. Its origins are not completely clear, but it was being circulated in Latin about the beginning of the ninth century and it was translated into Old Irish then also. It mentions important events of the Old and New Testament which occurred on a Sunday, according to the calculations of the author or his sources. These sources include orthodox writings by Jerome and Isidore as well as the apocryphal Letter of Christ fallen from the Sky, a work in praise of Sunday observance which dates back at least as far as the late sixth century. R.E. McNally, the editor of the Dies Dominica, gives a brief description of that curious Letter.

Although there is no direct connection between the Dies Dominica and the Chronica there is a similarity of typological approach. J. Daniélou suggests that the inspiration for the genre of typology found in the Dies Dominica is to be found in the apocryphal Book of Jubilees, and that in the early middle ages the typological interpretations acquired a pseudo-scientific veneer of the same kind as is to be found in the works of Isidore.¹⁸

There are however close connections between the Chronica and the genuine works of Claudius. The Chronica is dated to 814 in the text. In Claudius' commentary on Galatians, which was published in 816, comes the following passage:

18. op.cit., 160.

Manseruntque filii Israel in Aegypto, post introitum Jacob, annis ducentis quindecim. Post mortem Joseph annos centum quadraginta quatuor.... A prima igitur promissione Abrahae usque ad introitum Jacob in Aegyptum fuerunt anni ducenti quindecim. Et usque ad transitum maris Rubri, anni ducenti quindecim. Fiunt in summa quadringenti triginta. Et hoc est quod ait Apostolos hoc loco.¹⁹

The same words are found in the Chronica apart from the last sentence which is as follows:

Et hoc est quod ait Apostolos in Epistola ad Galatas. Hoc autem dico Testamentum confirmatum a Deo, qua post 430 annos facta est lex.²⁰

Since the passage is equally appropriate in the commentary and in the Chronica, it is impossible to say which version is the more original. I am inclined to think that the passage was copied out of the Chronica into the commentary because of the awkward shape of the last sentence in the commentary, viz:

"Et hoc est... hoc loco". The date of publication by itself is not conclusive since Claudius must have collected material for his commentaries long before he published them.²¹

Moreover, a sentence in the commentary on Samuel and Kings is also found in the Chronica.²² It contains the following words: "Nescire me fateor, quia non uspiam me legisse reminiscor, et ideo nec de imperitia erubesco, quia lectione non doceor, nec de periculo formido quia quae non lego nec praesumo...".

Another passage in the commentary on Samuel and Kings contains material that is very like sections of the Chronica.

19. MPL CIV, 872-3.

20. ibid., 921.

21. MGH EpKA II, 597, 598.

22. ibid., 608; Cf. MPL CIV, 925-6.

After a passage in the commentary quoted from Bede's Chronicle²³ comes the following:

Sedechias autem suprascriptus filius Josiae regnavit annis undecim: huius undecimo anno, regum autem Babylonis octavo, secundum dies lunares mense quarto, quinta die mensis, iuxta solares vero dies, octavo kalendas Julii, luna quinta, quem illi quintum diem computant, feria septima, aperta est civitas, et ingressi sunt omnes principes regum Babylonis, possideruntque civitatem, et captivum transduxerunt populum in Babylonem.... Si vero a me quaeratur per quid sciam hoc: aut quomodo potuit hoc fieri, ut talibus diebus, vel comprehensa fuerit civitas, vel incensa: respondeo, quia ipso anno decimo kalendas Aprilis exstitit, secundum dies lunares, anni principium, et primi mensis initium.²⁴

The corresponding passage in the Chronica is lost and so comparison is impossible. But in style and subject matter it is closely similar to the passages of the Chronica (Cf. the passages quoted earlier) which deal with other events. I believe that the lost passage from the Chronica should be regarded as the source, or at least the inspiration, for the passage from the commentary.

There are other links between the commentary and the Chronica. One is a common interest in textual variants. Another is a similar literary style. There is also a strong devotion to Augustine's works, expressed in extravagant terms in both the Chronica and in the prefaces to more than one of Claudius' commentaries.²⁵

Claudius' interest in recording textual variants has not so far attracted much notice. At the time when he wrote

23. MGH A.A. XIII, 248.

24. MPL CIV, 809.

25. MPL CIV, 918d. Cf. MGH EpKA II, 598, 599.

the commentary on Samuel and Kings he was able to quote from more than one text of the Old Latin versions of the Bible.²⁶ The name he sometimes used for these was the Septuaginta.²⁷ In the Chronica there is also a reference to the Septuaginta.²⁸

Stylistically, the Chronica is more like the work of Claudius than that of any other ninth-century writer whose work I have examined. The Latin is clumsy. There are many rhetorical questions such as one finds in the introductions to the commentaries of Claudius. The structure of sentences is involved and the words used are sometimes unnecessarily highflown, e.g. the frequent use of fateor and nuncupamus.

The events of Claudius' career also suggest possible motives for the composition of such a work. In 811 Claudius had completed his commentary on Genesis, in which he had dealt with the chronology of the Patriarchs, even if only briefly.²⁹ The passage in Claudius' commentary was copied from Jerome's Hebraicae Quaestiones in libro Geneseos.³⁰

In 814 appeared the Chronica and in the following year Claudius published his commentaries on St. Matthew and on Galatians. In both of these books of the Bible, the commentator meets with questions of chronology. Matthew I, 1-7 is the genealogy of Christ beginning from Abraham. Since this differs from the list of the Kings of Judah as found in

26. MPL CIV, 824b.

27. ibid., 645b, 811b.

28. ibid., 923c.

29. MPL L, 924.

30. C.C. LXXII, 8-9.

II Kings, Claudius would once more have his attention drawn to chronological questions. The passage from Galatians was dealt with earlier in this appendix. Claudius must have been engaged in the preparation of the commentaries at the time when the Chronica appeared.

In 814 Claudius followed his royal master to Aix. Would not the palace scholar wish to impress the clerical members of the Court by writing a short work of erudition? The Alcuinian revision of the Vulgate text, created and disseminated under royal patronage, was still relatively new. The process of revision would have drawn attention to the divergences between the manuscript traditions of the Latin Bible.

Since Claudius had been educated at Lyons, the home of some of the best Old Latin manuscripts,³¹ and since he knew the works of the Fathers, such as Augustine, who had quoted extensively from the Old Latin, he could hardly ignore the Old Latin completely. Claudius' attitude to the Old Latin was ambivalent. On the one hand he has preserved a considerable number of quotations from Old Latin manuscripts. On the other he talked of the Hebraica Veritas and in passages from Augustine's de Civitate Dei altered the text from Old Latin to Vulgate.³² It might therefore have seemed necessary to Claudius to expound the correct chronology of the Bible.

My arguments for believing that Claudius of Turin is the author of the Chronica may be summarized as follows. The

31. see Palaeographia Latina IV, 42-3.

32. Cf. MPL CIV, 645c-647c; 648c.

work was written at a time which fits very well with the known events of the life of Claudius. The only author that I have found who quoted from it is Claudius of Turin. Part of the Chronica seems to be the original work of the author himself and no material of the same kind has been found other than the short passage at the end of book four of Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings. Stylistically and in other ways there are similarities between the Chronica and works by Claudius. The description of the author by the name of Claudius alone would accord with the practice followed by Claudius of Turin in some of his commentaries,³³ and no other contemporary scholar of the same name is known to have existed.

Since the evidence produced points to Claudius of Turin being the author and since no suitable alternative candidate has been proposed, I consider that the treatise may be regarded as an undoubted composition by Claudius of Turin.

33. MGH EpKA II, 590, 593, 596, 597.

Appendix Two

Theutmir's Letter.

Eternal greetings in the Lord to my dear master and lord Claudius, bishop of the see of Turin, from Theutmir, your son, of all abbots the least.

My father and teacher, I have read the book of Exodus which you sent and I rejoiced in it with exceeding great joy, just as you yourself know about the Epistles of Paul, that teacher of the Gentiles, from the other letter that I sent. Also the venerable father Leidrad, who used to be the bishop of Lyons, when he heard this news was pleased, and begged me to copy much of it for him. He wondered why you had not sent a letter to him for so long a time and promised that he would send a letter to you. For he genuinely wishes to see you if it is possible, and if not to see you in the flesh at least to receive a letter.

What can I say about our father Nimbridius, the Archbishop of Narbonne? — how immensely pleased he was when I told him of the exposition of the aforesaid book; how humbly he begged me to read or copy it. He also wondered why you had not sent a letter to him. Please send letters often to the bishops, abbots and monks in this district, most of all, please, to me, your son, as I desire and long always for this thing.

Among other things, I beg you to send me explanations of questions about the book of Kings which I have sent you on a small sheet, with interpretations not only in the

historical sense but also in an allegorical or tropological sense. First, how much meaning does it have historically; second, can it be understood allegorically; third, in all cases, in the moral sense? On those thirty questions which at the request of Nothelm, Bede the presbyter expounded from the aforesaid book of Kings, I have not asked you to give us an explanation because we have them here in one volume together with the de Templo Salomonis as it has been expounded by the aforesaid presbyter Bede. Among the other requests, I beg that you correct these questions of mine and expound them in proper order. As a teacher corrects his pupil, correct whatever I may have said from lack of skill in speaking. For I have not sent (the material) in proper order because of a certain haste and carelessness of the writer. Please put it into proper historical order.

(The Capitula to Bede's XXX Quaestiones)

If it seems wise to you, let these thirty questions and the answers to them together with those questions from the aforesaid book of Kings which I sent to be explained by your holiness, after they have been explained by you, be united in one work in their proper order. As you yourself know, place your preface and my request as little prefaces at the beginning of the explanations concerning the aforesaid questions. In all the writing that you send to these parts, you have not forgotten me, but you have always deigned to advise me what I ought to do. Above all I beg that in your

prayers you pray to the Lord on my behalf, and may others also pray for your studies. For if the prayer of one just man has great power - as you yourself know - how much more must the assiduous prayers of many. Farewell, my father, and may you always be rich in the good fortune of your spiritual sons.

MGH EpKA II, 605-7.

Claudius' Reply.

Most dear brother Theutmir, your importunate and manifold request compels and forces me, not by compulsion but by what is stronger, by love, to undergo the fearsome public judgement of many: of those I say who know how to judge, not justly, but according to appearances. It is because of that, I presume, that you order me to put at the head of my works expounding the Pentateuch and the book of Kings, both your request and my preface: a thing that to many people of our time seems to be presumptuous and laughable. If they know the meaning of the word preface, I do not think they could say what you said; because a preface is the speech at the beginning of a work, the preamble to a book which is attached in order to prepare the ears of the hearers before the arguments of the narrative.

A preface is, so to speak, a preamble, i.e., the first part of a talk; and by another name it is a prologue, i.e. the beginning of a talk and the start of the composition, and it

also is called, by another name, a proem. For a proem is the beginning of teaching and the start of a book which is attached in order to prepare the ears of the hearers before the narration of an argument. Many accomplished Latinists have used that name. Anyone may know that knowledge is lacking in our time, not time for writing what we know.

Doubtless there will be time for commenting on all the Scriptures if the grace of the Holy Spirit deigns to be present with someone; nor are you to reproach anyone for the length of time he takes to write a book. This only is to be judged - whether what a man writes is true and catholic, or false and heretical.

Because you often demand from me the explanation of many questions, especially in the Pentateuch and the book of Kings, which are the older and more obscure of all the books of the divine Law, and which lack a great interpreter, so in these, not from my own ability, but from the pronouncements of famous doctors, not from my own rashness, but from the authority of others, I have made reply to your questions, not as I ought but as I was able, maintaining not so much the ostentation of lofty eloquence as the style of needful brevity. For in this manner the treatise will be able to satisfy your innumerable questions; moreover it will be somewhat independent of me, which will, I think, be useful for your idea of inserting it among other books if you judge your ideas acceptable. However I wish you to know, brother, that these words open ways to learning; but they do not explain and clear up one by one all the things that were written.

As far as I was able, I have replied to your questions. If you have found, or are able to find, anything better about these matters of which you asked me, I should be most grateful if you would let me know. Therefore I beg you by the grace of God which I believe abounds in you, that you do not reject my prayer but gladly teach, if you can at all, what I confess I do not know. Also if you have heard of or read, or even are able to hear of or read, or think out anything from this that has been solved and proved by a complete rational argument, I beg you not to be unwilling to send it because it is more appropriate for me to learn from you than to teach you what must be revealed to your love. For we are admonished by what the prophet James says, "Let every man be quick to hear but slow to speak". And as the most learned father Augustine says, "As we learn, the sweetness of knowledge ought to allure us; but as we teach, the compulsion of love ought to compel us". What we ought rather to pray for is that the necessity for one man to teach another should end; and that we might all be taught by God - although we may be so taught when we speak of those matters which belong to true piety, even when a man is seen to teach this. For neither is the man who plants anything, nor he who reaps; but it is God who gives the increase. Since therefore if God had not given the increase, the apostles would have in no way been sowers or reapers, how much more would you or I, or any other man of this time, who in this present age seem to be learned?

I have also added to this work a short allegorical exposition of the book of Ruth which you did not ask for, and

which seems to belong rather to the book of Judges than to Kings. Therefore I beg you not to cease from commending, in your prayers to the creator of all, me who though far off in body, yet am near in mind, so that by the power of your tears and the merits of your prayers, even if I am detained near the river Chobar - that is, even if I am weighed down by the present age - still I may desire to see our Lord in the majesty of his glory and hear from him, himself, that our habitation is placed in the midst of scorpions.

ibid., 607-608.

Claudius' Second Letter

Since then, by the favour of God, I think I have satisfied some of your questions in these previous books, dearest brother Theutmir, I have taken care to add on to the end of this book some of your questions since it seems to me superfluous, that I ought to mix bare questions of the letter among spiritual flowers of allegory. Some (questions) remain undiscussed since neither did I find anything on that transcribed in ancient manuscripts nor did I read anything expounded in the works of our predecessors. I say that I do not know anything of these, because I do not remember that I have read anything. That is why I do not blush for my inexperience, since I have not learned from reading. I do not fear that danger because I do not presume to teach what I do not understand.

While I was holding your questions in my hands, after the previous books were already finished, so that I might write something next in reply, there came to me a letter from Aix, sent straight from the royal palace, telling how you caused a copy of my tractate on the letters to the Corinthians, which I presented to you two years ago, to be produced at that palace I spoke of, for condemnation by a court of Bishops and Magnates. My friends accepted this treatise not only politely but even in a friendly way, not to condemn it but to copy it. May the Lord who is the witness of my life and the giver of my work, not know you who did not fear to remove part of the truth by words, and sitting in judgement against me, you speak lies and you have made a scandal against a son of mother Church, and if you live, may you suffer in mind the death which Oza suffered in body for his unlawful audacity.

ibid., 608-9.

Appendix Three

"Bede's de Templo and the Commentary on Samuel and Kings by Claudius of Turin".

(Communication to the Bede Conference 1973 which will be printed in the volume of Proceedings provisionally entitled Famulus Dei, edited by G. Bonner.)

One of the most striking survivals from the time of Bede is the set of three tiny glazed windows on the south side of the church at Jarrow. Is it possible that Bede was thinking of these very windows when he wrote in the de Templo about the fenestrae obliquae¹ of the Jewish Temple? The windows, Bede wrote, were narrow outside and widened out inside the building. They represent the holy and spiritual doctors of the Church who have received the vision of God's mysteries. What they have received secretly they show openly to the faithful, just as the windows receive the rays of the sun and spread light into all the dark places of the Temple.

Bede's treatise on the Temple of Solomon was one of three works that he wrote about the sacred buildings of the Jews. They were all works of his maturity, written not long before the Ecclesiastical History. They are all exegetical works, explaining the passages from the Bible which describe the Tabernacle and the first and second Temple. The de Templo²

1. C.C. CXIX A p. 162 (all references to the de Templo are from D. Hurst's edition in the Corpus Christianorum series, volume CXIX A, (Turnholt, 1969) pp. 143-234.)

2. Hurst, D., ed., C.C. CXIX A, pp. 143-234.

begins with a brief preface addressed to Bishop Acca. Then comes a set of capitula, brief summaries or chapter headings to divide up the whole work. The work itself is in two books. The first chapter of book one is introductory; in it Bede explains his allegorisation of Solomon's Temple and all its parts as representing the Christian Church and all its parts. Then follows the exegesis, mainly allegorical, of the biblical narrative of the building of Solomon's Temple, i.e. I Kings, chapters five to seven.

A modern student of Bede might feel disappointment that Bede did not describe the geographical position and surroundings of the Temple, although it must be admitted that Bede had done so elsewhere,³ and that he did not give a ground plan of the Temple, although he knew of two works that might have provided a model for him. These were Adamnan's book about the holy sites of the East⁴ which Bede used in the preparation of a similar work of his own, and a Bible prepared for Cassiodorus⁵ which contained a plan of the Temple.

The de Templo contains many examples of number symbolism and allegorical interpretation, but does not contain much factual information or details of literal interpretation. It is a work inspired much more by the example of Gregory the Great than by that of Jerome.

Almost a hundred years after Bede wrote the de Templo, Claudius, the Bishop of Turin, was completing his commentary

3. Bedae de Locis Sanctis, C.C. CLXXV, pp. 251-64.

4. Adamnani de Locis Sanctis in C.C. CLXXV, pp. 183-234.

5. C.C. CXIX A, pp. 192-3.

on the Books of Ruth, Samuel, and Kings, his libri quattuor informationum litterae et spiritus in Regum et Ruth. Claudius had been born in Spain and went as a young man to Lyons, drawn, as he said himself,⁶ by a desire for knowledge of sacred Scripture to leave his own land and people. In Lyons, which under the episcopate of Leidrad, was one of the centres of culture in Charlemagne's Empire, Claudius spent some years in study and perhaps in teaching. From Lyons he was sent to the court of Louis the Pious, King of Aquitaine, to teach in a school which was attached to it. In 811 he published his first commentary, that on Genesis, presenting his lectures on sacred Scripture in written form.

In 814 when Charlemagne died, Claudius followed his royal master, now Emperor of all his father's domains, to Aix. During the next two years he published a Brevis Chronica, a commentary on the Gospel of Matthew and the first of a series of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. In 816 Claudius was made Bishop of Turin by Louis because of his skill in explaining that sacred learning of which the Italian people were sadly ignorant.⁷ Claudius ordered the removal of all images, i.e. pictures, from the churches of Turin, because he said that they were being worshipped. A violent storm of opposition arose, which grew stronger when Claudius removed crosses also, forbade the cult of relics and would

6. Bellet, P., "Oració de Claudi de Torí en el comentari a Hebreus del Pseudo Ató de Vercelli" in Fischer, B., and Fiala, V., ed., Colligere Fragmenta: Festschrift Alban Dold (Beuron, 1952), pp. 140-3.

7. Jonas of Orleans, de Cultu Imaginum, MPL CVI, 305-6.

not celebrate saints' days. This attack on popular forms of religion brought on him not only the hatred of the mob but the censure of a church synod at Aix and the loss of old friends. Throughout this period Claudius retained his position as Bishop, was employed by the government as a Missus, and found time to complete several commentaries. He died some time between 827 and 832.

The commentary on Ruth, Samuel, and Kings is, like all of Claudius' exegetical works, a catena, a mosaic of passages from the works of the Church Fathers, which has been supplemented by a few short passages written by Claudius himself. The commentaries were school works and were intended for the teaching of that subject which was regarded as the crown of all knowledge, sacred Scripture. The commentaries of Claudius and Hrabanus are collections of patristic exegesis for the schools of their day, just as the homiliaries of the same period are collections of patristic exegesis for liturgical purposes.

In the commentary on Samuel and Kings Claudius incorporated extracts from a homily by Origen and another attributed to Chrysostom, both in Latin translation. Other sources are works by Jerome, Augustine, Gregory (through the liber testimoniorum of Paterius), Caesarius of Arles, "Eusebius Gallicanus", Isidore, and Bede. The works of Bede used by Claudius were the XXX Quaestiones, the VIII Quaestiones, the de Templo, brief sections from the de Temporum Ratione and the Commentary on Mark, and possibly the Nomina Locorum and the de Locis Sanctis. Claudius, like Hrabanus, did not know

Bede's Commentary on I Samuel.

Claudius' commentary on Samuel and Kings was published by J.C. Trombelli⁸ in 1752 from a manuscript in Pistoia Cathedral.⁹ Trombelli said in the introduction to his edition¹⁰ that Claudius' commentary bore a suspiciously close resemblance to a commentary on the same books published by J.A. Kohlburger in 1531¹¹ from a manuscript at Heiligenkreuz. The manuscript attribution of that commentary to Eucherius of Lyons, who died in 450 A.D., was accepted by Kohlburger, but is obviously wrong since the commentary includes excerpts from later writers up to the time of Bede, i.e. 735 A.D. Trombelli cautiously suggested that Claudius was the author of the Pseudo-Eucherian version as well as that published under his own name.

Trombelli's remarks do not appear to have attracted the attention of later writers on Eucherius or on Claudius. P. Bellet in 1950 published an article¹² in which he noted that the Pseudo-Eucherian commentary was almost identical with the commentary published under Claudius' name. Claudius' version begins with two introductory letters and contains an

8. Trombelli, J.C., Veterum Patrum Latinorum opuscula numquam adhuc edita (Bologna, 1752), reprinted in MPL CIV, 623-834.

9. Pistoia Capitolare 96 (XI saec).

10. MPL CIV, 622.

11. Kohlburger, J.A. (Brassicanus), D. Eucherii Lugdunensis episcopi doctissimi Lucubrationes aliquot...in Genesim Commentariorum libri III; in libros Regum Commentariorum libri IV (Basle, 1531), reprinted in MPL L, 1047-1208.

12. "Claudio de Turín, autor de los comentarios in genesim et regum del Pseudo Eucherio" in Estudios Biblicos IX (1950), pp. 209-223. P. Bellet discussed the same subject briefly in a later article "El liber de Imaginibus Sanctorum bajo el nombre de Agobardo de Lyon obra de Claudio de Turín" in Analecta Sacra Tarracon. 26 (1953), 151-194, but did not modify his views in any way.

appendix at the end of the main commentary. In the four books of the commentary, apart from one long passage, the differences are of the slightest and are no more than can be accounted for by different manuscript traditions.

The Pseudo-Eucherian version was printed from a manuscript of Heiligenkreuz which is now lost. However a similar manuscript from the monastery of Gottweig¹³ also attributes the commentary to Eucherius. An older manuscript now in Vienna contains an attribution in a modern hand to Eucherius,¹⁴ but seems to have circulated without any author's name attached to it since a copy, made in the twelfth century, now at Zwettl,¹⁵ attributes the commentary to Angelonius (sic) of Luxeuil. It is likely that a manuscript (or more than one) lost the introductory letters which contain the author's name, and other subsidiary matter. From this (or these) is descended the group of manuscripts localised in Austria. The name of Eucherius, like that of Angelomus, is the conjecture of a medieval scribe.

Modern attempts to find an author for the Pseudo-Eucherian version, such as P. Capelle's suggestion¹⁶ that it was written by an "anglicus" and Professor Hamman's¹⁷ that the writer was the otherwise unknown author of the Epitome

13. Vienna 691 (XII saec).

14. Vienna 710 (X saec).

15. Zwettl 89 (XII saec).

16. Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique (Collectanea Biblica latina, IV) (Rome, 1913), p. 120, note 2.

17. MPL Supplementum III, 47-8.

Moralium Sancti Gregorii in Job,¹⁸ cannot be entertained unless one is willing to deny Claudius all responsibility for the version published under his own name.

Now I wish to turn to the one major difference between the two versions of Claudius' commentary. In Book III when Claudius reached I Kings chapter 5, i.e. the building of Solomon's Temple,¹⁹ he began to copy from the de Templo of Bede. He omitted the preface and the first chapter. Line 61 of Hurst's edition of the de Templo begins,²⁰ "historia of Kings tells that Solomon, when he was about to build the house for the Lord, asked help from Hiram, the King of Tyre..."; Claudius began his extract from that point, i.e. he omitted all that was not exegesis of the Biblical text.

In the version published under the name of Claudius the extract ends at line 392 of Hurst's edition,²¹ i.e. about one tenth of the de Templo is copied out. Then comes the following sentence, "aedificium in superiore huius voluminis parte habes a beato Beda expositum". This is followed by exegesis of I Kings, 8, I f, taken from Bede's XXX Quaestiones.

In the version published under the name of Eucherius there is no break at the end of the "short text". The de Templo is copied into the commentary from line 61 of the first book to the end of the second, with one passage omitted

18. attributed to Odo of Cluny, MPL CXXXVIII, 105-512.

19. MPL CIV, 726 and MPL L, 1104.

20. C.C. CXIX A, p. 148.

21. ibid., p.157 and MPL CIV, 733.

and one very brief interpolation between the two books of the de Templo, i.e. more than nine tenths of the de Templo are included.

Both the passage omitted and the interpolation have relevance to the work of Claudius. The passage omitted is a short one in which Bede praised images as visual aids to devotion.²² Since Claudius believed that the cult of images was corrupting the life of the Church, it is hardly to be expected that he would wish to copy a passage containing views so different from his own. The interpolation,²³ two sentences long, is a comparison of two different texts of I Kings 6.35. One is "nostra translatio", the text used by Bede, and the other is the "septuaginta" by which is meant an Old Latin version. Since Claudius provided about a dozen references to Old Latin texts in other parts of the commentary, and the style of the passage is similar to work written by Claudius, there can be little doubt that Claudius added that note.

P. Bellet considered²⁴ that the short text of the de Templo was the one used by Claudius himself and that the long text was an interpolation made by a scribe who had access to a manuscript of the de Templo which had been doctored by Claudius. Thus the omission of the passage about images and the addition of the passage about textual variants can be explained as Claudius' work and yet not part of the original commentary on Samuel and Kings.

22. ibid., pp.306-7; Book II, lines 809-66.

23. MPL L, 1132.

24. op.cit., 218.

Bellet had a further problem to contend with when he suggested that the short text was the original one. The version containing the short text includes capitula, lists of chapter headings, at the beginning of each of the four books of the commentary. The evidence from the capitula to Book Three is as follows.²⁵ The first three capitula refer to passages at the beginning of the book; capitula four, five, and six refer to the "short text" and capitula twenty-eight to thirty-three are summaries of the part of the book coming after the end of the short text. To the other twenty-one capitula from "Quando vel ubi aedificatum sit templum" to "de cardinibus ostiorum, et perfectione domus Domini" (i.e. capitula seven to twenty-seven) there is no corresponding text in the commentary.

If we turn to the capitula to Bede's de Templo as printed in Hurst's edition,²⁶ we find twenty-five sections listed. The first, "Quod aedificatio tabernaculi et templi unam eandemque Christi ecclesiam designet" clearly refers to the first sixty lines, the section which Claudius did not include in his commentary. The second of Bede's list is "Quomodo Hiram..." which is exactly the same as Claudius' fourth capitulum and the two lists are exactly the same from then on until the "de cardinibus ostiorum..." which is the last of Bede's capitula.

Bellet offered as a solution to this problem of a set of capitula for which there was no text in the commentary

25. MPL CIV, 721-2.

26. C.C. CXIX A, p. 146.

the evidence of the other printed edition, the Pseudo-Eucherian version. Kohlburger printed chapter headings in the text. Since these differed in some respects from the capitula of Trombelli's edition, Bellet said that the capitula "did not belong to the manuscript tradition of the long text!"²⁷

I suggest that the long text is the original version. This offers a solution to the difficulties noted by Bellet in his article. We no longer have to postulate a manuscript of the de Templo which Claudius had altered and from which he had omitted one well known and much quoted passage, and which was then integrated into a copy of Claudius' commentary. The text of Book Three of the commentary now agrees with the capitula to that book as printed in Trombelli's edition and with the six surviving manuscripts of the commentary.

These manuscripts can be divided into three families. The three Austrian manuscripts²⁸ have either no attribution or a false one. They contain the long text (as did the now lost manuscript of Heiligenkreuz from which the Pseudo-Eucherian version was printed) and the capitula as given in Trombelli's edition. The two Italian manuscripts²⁹ both contain the short text, the capitula as in Trombelli's edition, and the introductory letters naming Claudius as the author. (Trombelli's edition was in fact made from one of these, Pistoia 96.) The Paris manuscript,³⁰ although late, contains a reliable text; for example, it is the only manuscript to have conserved

27. op.cit., 219.

28. see n. 13, 14, 15.

29. Pistoia Capitolare 96 (XI saec); Mantua Comunale C.V.2 (XI saec).

30. Paris Nat. Lat. 17380 (Coll. Navarre)(XIV saec).

the original title of the commentary. It contains the long text, the same capitula as the other manuscripts, and the introductory letters by Claudius.

Some problems remain for discussion if we accept the long text as original. The first is the chapter headings in the Pseudo-Eucherian version. They are different from those in the six extant manuscripts, but the differences are not really very great. I suspect that the chapter headings do not come from the manuscript of Heiligenkreuz, but were concocted by the editor Kohlburger from the capitula in that manuscript and from his own imagination.

A second and more serious objection to my proposal is the assertion by Bellet that Claudius did not copy complete works into his commentary since it was to be a catena. However, it is more likely that, since Claudius was writing a commentary on certain books of the Bible, he copied all the exegesis that was relevant to his purpose. The long text is used in this way. Claudius omitted the introductory letter and the initial paragraphs where Bede expounded his theory that the Temple and its parts were allegories for the Church and its parts. The remainder of the de Templo consists of exegesis of the text of I Kings chapters five to seven. If Claudius had found the de Templo too long for his purposes he might have treated it as Hrabanus did in his commentary on Samuel and Kings.³¹ He abbreviated almost every paragraph of the de Templo so that the work was shortened by about one third, omitting for example the section in praise

31. in MPL CIX, 9-280; the extracts from the de Templo are in 133-84.

of images. However he did retain some of Bede's comments on every section of the Bible text.

Claudius copied out of his sources whatever was useful. The works by Paterius and Isidore were used almost in their entirety, and his omissions from Augustine's ad Simplicianum and from book seventeen of the de Civitate are of the briefest. In the unpublished commentary on Matthew is to be found all of Augustine's work on the Sermon on the Mount, and in the little commentary on Ruth Claudius used Isidore's work on the same book without any alteration. If Claudius found the whole of an author's composition was useful to him he transcribed it all.

A third problem is the question of how the short text might have arisen. The answer may well be in the note at the end of the short text, "You have the building of the Temple expounded by the blessed Bede in the earlier part of this volume."³² Claudius' commentary in four of the surviving six manuscripts is bound up with one or more commentaries or religious works, although never with the de Templo. I suggest that a scribe who had already written a copy of the de Templo was engaged in the writing of Claudius' commentary in the same manuscript. After he had written a part of the de Templo extract in the commentary he recognised that he was copying out the same material. The short text ends a few lines after a Vergilian quotation about the whiteness of Parian marble.³³ Even the most obtuse and mechanical of scribes would surely have noticed that. In order to save

32. see n. 21.

33. C.C. CXIX A, p. 156.

time and parchment, the scribe added his note, turned to the end of the extract from the de Templo and resumed his copying of the commentary.

Should it be thought unlikely that a scribe would omit parts of a commentary in this way, it must be pointed out that five of the six manuscripts of Claudius' commentary have been shortened in another way, either by the omission of one or more of the introductory letters, of the short commentary on Ruth, or of the appendix to the commentary.³⁴ Scribes appear to have believed that they could treat Claudius' commentary with some freedom since it was after all a school work and not a literary text.

There is a parallel to the shortening of the text of the de Templo in another commentary by Claudius. Part of the commentary on Matthew was shortened, but since the part omitted was identified, and the book from which it was drawn was well known and readily available in the Middle Ages, anyone who wished to read the part omitted should not have had any great difficulty in finding a copy. The work is Augustine's commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. All the manuscripts that I have seen contain the whole of the work, except for the manuscript Vallicelliana C.3 in Rome, which was written at Lyons in the ninth century. In this the scribe has abbreviated Augustine's commentary by writing one Bible verse and the first sentence of Augustine's exposition only, and then going on to the next verse and one sentence of exposition on that. Thus that part of the commentary makes

34. all the MSS except Mantua C.V. 2.

hardly any sense at all. However the scribe, following the practice set down by Claudius in his introduction to the commentary, placed identifying initials opposite the work of each of the Fathers, e.g. Aug or Ag for Augustine. It would not have been difficult to trace the relevant extracts.

Since Claudius' purpose in writing his commentaries was the modest one of providing a tool for the schools of the Carolingian Empire, his own originality of thought did not appear in them. However his commentary on Samuel and Kings should not be dismissed as totally unimportant. Since Claudius, like his contemporaries, did not know of Gregory's or Bede's commentaries on I Samuel, he was the first as far as he knew to attempt to write a full length work on these four books of the Bible. He found a wide variety of sources, and put them together after making as few changes as possible to them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P.R. and Evans, C.F. Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. I: From the Beginnings to Jerome. Cambridge, 1970.
- Altaner, B. Patrology, English translation. Freiburg 1960.
- Baehrens, W.A. Überlieferung und Textgeschichte der lateinisch erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament; Texte und Untersuchungen XLII, I. Leipzig, 1916.
- Bardy, G. "La littérature patristique des 'Questiones et Responsiones' sur l'Écriture Sainte." Revue Biblique, XLI (1932), 210-36, 341-69, 515-37; XLII (1933), 14-30, 211-29, 328-52.
- Bardy, G. et al. Élie le prophète I (Études Carmélitaines) Paris, 1956.
- Bellet, P. "Claudio de Turín, autor de los comentarios 'in genesim et regum' del Pseudo Eucherio". Estudios Biblicos IX (1950), 209-23.
- _____ "Oració di Claudi di Torí en el comentari a Hebreus del Pseudo Attó de Vercelli". Fischer, B. and Fiala, V. (ed.) Colligere Fragmenta; Festschrift Alban Dold, 140-143. Beuron, 1952.
- _____ "Il 'liber de imaginibus sanctorum' bajo el nombre de Agobardo de Lyon, obra de Claudio de Turín." Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia XXVI (1953), 151-94.
- Berger, S. Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Age. Paris, 1893.
- Billen, A.V. The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch. Cambridge, 1927.
- Bischoff, B. "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegesis in Frühmittelalter." Sacris Erudiri VI (1954), part 2, 189-279.
- _____ "Aus Alkuins Erdentagen." Medievalia et Humanistica XIV (1962), 31-38.
- _____ "Fruehkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat." Scriptorium XXII (1968), 306-14.
- Blumenkranz, B. "Raban Maur et Saint Augustin, Compilation ou adaptation." Revue du Moyen Age Latin, VII (1951), 97-111.
- _____ Les auteurs Chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les juifs et le judaïsme. Paris, 1963.

- Bofitto, G. "Il Codice Vallicelliano C III." Atti delle Reale Accademia della scienze di Torino XXXIII (1898), 250-285.
- Brown, P. Augustine of Hippo. London 1967.
- Cabaniss, A. Agobard of Lyons. Syracuse, 1953.
- caps Capelle, P. le texte du Psautier Latin en Afrique; Collectanea Biblica Latina IV, Rome, 1913.
- Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo. Settimane di Studio X. La Bibbia nell'alto Medioevo. Spoleto, 1963.
- Charlier, C. "La compilation Augustinienne de Florus sur l'apôtre." Rev. Bén. LVII (1947), 132-186.
- _____ "les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire." in Mélanges E. Podéchar, 71-84, Lyon, 1945.
- Chatillon, J. "Isidore et Origène" in Mélanges André Robert, 536-547. Paris, 1957.
- Cipolla, C. Monumenta Novaliciensia Vetustiora, Rome, 1898.
- Comba, E. Claudio di Torino. Florence, 1895.
- Cordoliani, A. "La texte de la Bible en Irlande duVe auX^e siècle." Revue Biblique LVII (1950), 5-41.
- _____ "Les traités de comput du haut moyen âge (526-1003)" in Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin du Cange) XVII (1943), 51-72.
- Courcelle, P. Le Lettres Greques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore. 2nd Edition, Paris, 1948.
- Curtius, E.R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. Trans. W.R. Trask. London, 1953.
- Daniélou, J. From Shadows to Reality. Trans. W. Hibberd, London, 1960.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London, 1956.
- de Aldama, J.A. Repertorium Pseudo Chrysostomicum. Paris, 1965.
- de Ghellinck, J. Patristique et Moyen Age II. Brussels, 1947.
- de Lubac, H. Exégèse Médiévale (4 vols.) Paris, 1959-64.

- de Montfaucon, B. Diarium Italicum. Paris, 1702.
- Dekkers, E. and Gaar, A. Clavis Patrum Latinorum. Sacris Erudiri, III, 2nd Edition, (1961).
- Delisle, L. "les vols. de Libri au Séminaire d'Autun." Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes LIX (1898), 386-92.
- Devresse, R. Les Anciens Commentateurs grecs de l'octateuch et des rois. (Studi e Testi No.201), Rome, 1959.
- Diaz y Diaz, M.C. Isidoriana, Leon, 1961.
- _____ Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi Hispanorum, part 1. Salamanca, 1958.
- Duckett, E.S. Carolingian Portraits. Michigan, 1952.
- Engels, L.J. et al., (ed.) Melanges offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann, Utrecht, 1963.
- Etaix, R. "Le liber Testimoniorum de Paterius." Revue des Sciences Religieuses XXXII (1958), 66-7.
- Faider, P. and Mme. Faider-Feytmans. Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique de la ville de Mons. Ghent, 1931.
- Fischer, B. and Fiala, V. (ed.) Colligere Fragmenta; Festschrift Alban Dold. Beuron, 1952.
- Fliche, A. and Martin, V. Histoire de l'Eglise: vol. 6, l'Epoque Carolingienne by E. Amann. Paris, 1947.
- Foerster, W. Gnosis, Vol. I. Oxford, 1972.
- Fontaine, J. Isidore de Seville et la Culture classique dans l'Espagne Wisigothique, Paris, 1959.
- Fransen, I. "Un Nouveau Témoin latin de l'Homélie d'Origène sur le livre des Rois." Rev. Bén. LXXVIII (1968), 108-117.
- Glunz, H.H. History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon. Cambridge, 1933.
- Glorieux, P. Pour Revaloriser Migne (Melanges de Science Religieuse, IX (1952) Suppl. Lille, 1952.
- Gorissen, P. "La chapelle palatine des souverains Carolingiens." Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique LVI (1961), No.2, 463-70.

- Gottlieb, T. Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Oesterreichs, I. Vienna, 1915.
- Greenslade, E. (ed.) The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. III; The West from the Reformation to the Present Day. Cambridge, 1963.
- Hablitzel, J.B. "Hrabanus Maurus und Claudius von Turin." Historisches Jahrbuch, XXVII (1906), 74-85, XXXVIII (1917), 538-52.
- Hanson, R.P.C. Allegory and Event. London, 1959.
- Hermann, H.J. Die deutschen romanischen Handschriften (Wickhoff, F. (ed.) Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Oesterreich, VIII, 3) Leipzig, 1926.
- Hunter Blair, P. The World of Bede. London, 1970.
- Jones, C.W. Bede's Commentary on Genesis. Sacris Erudiri XIX (1969-70), 115-198.
- _____. Beda's Opera de Temporibus. Cambridge, Mass. 1943.
- Jones, L.W. (ed.) Studies in Honour of E.K. Rand. New York, 1938.
- Kristeller, P.O. Latin Manuscript Books before 1600. 3rd ed. New York, 1965.
- Labbé, P. Novae Bibliothecae Manuscriptorum Librorum Tomus Primus, Paris, 1653.
- _____. De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, Paris, 1660.
- La Bonnardière, A-M. Biblia Augustiniana, A.T. II. (Livres Historiques), Paris, 1960.
- _____. "Saint Augustin et les Libri Regnorum" in Studia Patristica; Texte und Untersuchungen I (1957), 375-388.
- Laistner, M.L.W. Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500-900. 2nd edition. London, 1957.
- _____. The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages. Ithaca, 1957.
- _____. "Antiochene Exegesis in Western Europe." Harvard Theological Review XL (1947), 19-32.
- _____. and King, H.H. A handlist of Bede Manuscripts. Ithaca, 1943.

- Lampe, G.W.H. (ed.) Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. II. The West from the Fathers to the Reformation. Cambridge, 1969.
- Lesne, E. Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France, vol. V.: les écoles de la fin du VIII^e siècle à la fin du XII^e. Lille, 1940.
- Levison, W. England and the Continent in the Eighth Century. Oxford, 1946.
- Lowe, E.A. Codices Lugdunenses Antiquissimi. Lyons, 1924.
 _____ Codices Latini Antiquiores, vol. VI. Oxford, 1953.
- Mabillon, J. De Re Diplomatica. 2nd edition, Paris, 1709.
- Macarrone, M. (ed.) Vescovi e Diocesi in Italia nel Medioevo. Padua, 1964.
- McCracken, G.E. and Cabaniss, A. Early Medieval Theology. Library of Christian Classics, vol. IX. London, 1957.
- McNally, R.E. "Dies Dominica : two Hiberno-Latin texts." Medieval Studies XXII (1960), 355-361.
- Manitius, M. Geschichte der lateinischen literatur des Mittelalters I, _____ Munich, 1911.
- Martin, E.J. History of the Iconoclastic Movement. London, 1930.
- Menéndez y Pelayo, M. Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles, Buenos Aires, 1945.
- Muckle, J.T. "Greek Works translated directly into Latin before 1350 (I, before 1000)." Medieval Studies, IV (1942), 33-43.
- Poole, R.L. Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning. 2nd ed. reprinted New York, 1960.
- Quentin, H. Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate, Part I, Octateuch. Rome/Paris, 1922.
- Sabatier, P. Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae. 3 vols. Paris, 1751.
- Saltman, A. "Rabanus Maurus and the Pseudo-Hieronymian Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libros Regum et Paralipomenon." Harvard Theological Review LXVI (1973), 43-75.

- Schoenbach, A.E. "Ueber einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters." Sitzungsberichte Kais. Akademie... Wissenschaften in Wien, (Phil.-Hist. Classe) CXLVI (1903), abh. IV.
- Siegmund, A. Die Ueberlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der Lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert (Abhandlungen der bayerischen Benediktiner-Akademie V), Munich, 1949.
- Smalley, B. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1952.
- Souter, A. "Traces of an unknown System of Capitula for St. Matthew's Gospel." Journal of Theological Studies XXXIII (1932), 188-189.
- Southern, R.W. The Making of the Middle Ages, London, 1959.
- _____ "Bede, the monk of Jarrow." The Listener 13th Feb., 1964; 267-269.
- _____ Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages. Harmondsworth, 1970.
- Spicq, C. Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen age. Paris, 1944.
- Stegmüller, F. Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi. 7 vols. Madrid, 1950-61.
- Stevenson, J. A New Eusebius. London, 1957.
- Tafel, S. "The Lyons Scriptorium." Palaeographia Latina, part IV, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 40-70. St. Andrews, 1925.
- Thompson, A.H. (ed.) Bede, his Life, Times and Writings. Oxford, 1925.
- Toal, M.F. The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers, vols. I-IV. London, 1957-63.
- Verbraken, P. "Le Commentaire de Saint Grégoire sur le Premier Livre des Rois." Rev. Bén. LXVI (1956), 159-217.
- Wallace Hadrill, J.M. The Barbarian West, 400-1000. London, 1952.
- Wasselynck, R. "l'Influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux (VIIe-XIIe S)." Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale XXXII (1965), 157-204.

- Weiss, J. "Essai de Datation du Commentaire sur les Proverbs attribué abusivement à Salonijs." Sacris Erudiri XIX (1969-70), 77-114.
- Wilmart, A. "Les Allégories sur l'écriture attribuées à Raban Maur." Rev. Bén. XXXII (1920), 47-56.
- _____ "Expositions d'un Evêque Fortunat sur l'Evangile." Rev. Bén. XXXII (1920), 160-174.
- _____ "Le Receuil Grégorien de Paterius." Rev. Bén. XXXIX (1927), 81-104.
- _____ "La Collection des 38 Homélies Latines de St. Jean Chrysostome." Journ. Theol. Stud. XIX (1917-18), 305-27.
- Winaudy, J. "L'oeuvre littéraire d'Ambroise Autpert." Rev. Bén. LX (1950), 93-119.
- Wotke, K. Der Genesiscommentar (I-IV, 1) des Pseudoeucherius im Codex Augiensis CXCI saec. X. Vienna, 1897.
- Zaccharia, A. Bibliotheca Pistorensis. Turin, 1752. ?

Unless otherwise stated, references to the Vulgate are taken from:

Biblia Sacra ad codicum fidem - ed St. Hieronymus in Urbe

Libri Josue, Iudicum, Ruth (Rome 1939)

Libri Samuel (Rome 1944)

Libri Malachim (Rome 1945)

References to the Septuagint are from:

Septuaginta ed. A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart 1935)

References to the Old Latin versions are from:

Vetus Latina Hispana, ed. T.A. Marazuela, vol. II

Octateuch (Madrid, 1967)